

*"We do not take possession of our ideas, but are possessed by them.
They master us and force us into the arena,
Where, like gladiators, we must fight for them."*

—HEINE.

THE ARENA

VOL. XXIX.

MAY, 1903.

No. 5.

MORMONISM AND POLYGAMY.

I. THE "MORMONISM" OF TO-DAY.

FULLY four-fifths of the people of this country, if asked "What is Mormonism?" would answer, "It means polygamy." There is no subject talked about so much that is so little understood. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, commonly called the Mormon Church, was organized April 6th, 1830, in the State of New York. It was not until 1843 that the revelation concerning plural marriage was made known by Joseph Smith, the earthly founder of the church. Even then it was not openly promulgated, but was practised by a very few individuals until 1852, when it was publicly proclaimed and its rightfulness recognized by the church. For obvious reasons only a minority of the "Mormon" people entered into plural family relations, and they did so under the most solemn covenants and agreements and religious ordinances.

It has been urged by persons who charge that Joseph Smith did not introduce the doctrine of plural marriage that strong denials of its practise were made by a number of persons in Nauvoo, among them many ladies, several of whom claim to have been sealed as wives to Joseph Smith, and that one elder in the church was excommunicated during the Prophet's lifetime for preaching polygamy. These statements are echoed by opponents of the "Mormons" for the purpose of showing that

the latter are guilty of double-dealing and deception. Fair investigation will show that in both cases the assertions are misleading and untrue.

During the period immediately preceding the assassination of Joseph and Hyrum Smith, what was known as "spiritual wifeism" was secretly taught by pretended Latter-day Saints, who subsequently apostatized and became the bitterest and most unscrupulous enemies of the "Mormons." Among them was the notorious John C. Bennett, who led away several foolish men and women by his wiles. It was that false and vicious doctrine that was denied by affidavit and by official declaration as being sanctioned by the church. The principle of celestial and plural marriage, as made known in the revelation of 1843, is not to be confounded with Bennett's system of lust, nor with polygamy as promulgated by the man who was cut off from the church for advocating it. Both have been repudiated, repeatedly, since the church accepted the plural marriage doctrine as brought to light by Joseph Smith the Seer.

The denials made by President John Taylor, for instance, which are often cited in this connection, had direct reference to the stories set on foot because of Bennett's depravity, and contained not one syllable against celestial or plural marriage as adopted by the church. The licentious practise thus denounced was as far from the pure principle revealed from on high as the slime of the gutter is from the glistening snow on the summits of our lofty mountain peaks. It is difficult to convince the prejudiced mind that any but base intents and impure desires prompted the practise of plural marriage, but nevertheless it was entered into, God knows, with the highest religious and moral motives.

It does not matter much to the general public whether plural marriage was or was not introduced by Joseph Smith in Nauvoo. It has become a disputed question because of the position taken by his son, as set forth in *THE ARENA* for August, 1902. Among the "Mormons" in Utah there is no doubt on this matter. The most intimate associates of the Prophet, his successors, and other church leaders declare they

received instructions concerning it from his lips. A number of ladies whose word is not doubted for a moment by those who know them best have testified in the most solemn manner, in public and in private, and also under oath before a notary, that they were married to him in Nauvoo. These, with hundreds of other persons acquainted with the facts, form a cloud of witnesses that establish this point beyond fair dispute. Against their attestations we have simply arguments, not unmixed with patent sophistry, in the nature of a lawyer's special plea, from the head of the "Reorganized" church, who announces, in the face of all the proofs advanced, that he "prefers to believe" his father did not preach or practise polygamy or a plurality of wives! Let the matter pass. It is the present that most concerns the public.

The legislation against polygamy by Congress, and the endeavors of the church to resist those enactments on the ground of their conflict with the first Amendment to the Constitution, are pretty well known to the American public. It is not so generally known that the final decision of the Supreme Court of the United States that the anti-polygamy laws were not in contravention to the Constitution was the chief reason for the change of attitude on the part of the church leaders.

One of the revelations, binding upon the Latter-day Saints, is that they shall obey all constitutional laws of the land. The "Manifesto" issued by President Wilford Woodruff in September, 1890, and accepted and ratified by the church in conference assembled, October 6th, 1890, was consequent upon the settlement of the question in its legal aspect. It put a stop to further plural marriages by sanction of the church. They have ceased to be solemnized. A number of families whose plural relations were entered into before that time still remain in that status, but they are rapidly decreasing through the death of one or more of the parties and from other causes. When it is understood that the marriage ceremony in each case was performed for time and all eternity, the chief reason for the persistence of those relations may be readily comprehended.

To-day the preaching of "Mormonism" does not include

plural marriage, and the elders of the church are forbidden to teach it. None but legal marriages are solemnized in or by the church, and the acts of Congress against polygamy are embodied in the statutes of the State. Marriage is regarded by the Latter-day Saints as a sacrament. Under its higher ecclesiastical law it involves an everlasting covenant. That does not end with death. The marriage does not take place in the resurrection, but in time and in this world. It is of the nature of that marriage in the Garden of Eden between a man and a woman in whom then there was no death. It was a wedding of immortals. That which was lost through sin in the "fall" was restored through obedience and the atonement of Christ in the regeneration, and the resurrection brings the parted pair together again as one, "no more twain but one flesh"—spiritual, but tangible and eternal. That which is sealed on earth to-day by divinely revealed authority is sealed in heaven and remains in spite of death, immutable, and abides forever.

The family thus formed is the basis of an ever-increasing kingdom and dominion continuing in worlds without end. Marriages are permitted for time only, as not all persons are fitted for the higher conditions and the pure and sacred obligations they impose. The secular law in all cases, whether for time or eternity, is honored, and that requires a license and a ceremony to be recorded under the State statutes, which provide heavy penalties for their violation. Monogamic wedlock is thus established by law in Utah, and is really more rigidly observed here than in any other part of the Union.

"Mormonism" inculcates chastity of life, self-restraint, temperance, abstinence from stimulants, order, peace, charity, and fraternity. It teaches submission to law and promotes true patriotism. It recognizes the institutions of this country as established under Divine direction. It does not unite Church and State. It supports each in its own sphere, but regards them as separate and distinct, and holds that neither should encroach upon the domain of the other. The "Mormon" Church does not dictate the politics of its members or direct citizens how they shall vote. The only restraint it claims to exercise as

to political office is, that, before any man who holds an ecclesiastical position demanding his entire services for the church becomes a candidate for a secular office that would take him from his church duties, he shall obtain permission to do so from its presiding authorities. This is absolutely necessary to proper church discipline, and is only reasonable and just. When that consent has been obtained, no man occupying a political office in this land is freer than he to perform his duty to his country, nor enjoys greater liberty as an American citizen. Notwithstanding all that is said and imagined as to the interference of the church in political affairs, no citizen can truthfully assert that he has been deprived by the church of his freedom, or that the church has attempted to coerce or control conventions, elections, or legislatures.

"Mormonism" is a term coined by its adversaries. It cannot mean anything but that which was taught by Mormon. He was a prophet of God on this hemisphere about sixteen centuries ago. His doctrines can be learned from the book that bears his name. It was translated by Joseph Smith from metallic plates covered with ancient hieroglyphics and deposited by Mormon when his nation was about to perish, under the warlike race from which our present Indian tribes descended. Those doctrines are, simply, the gospel of Jesus Christ as he delivered it in person on this land, after His resurrection and ascension from Palestine. They are unmixed with the precepts of men. They are the principles of salvation. They teach faith, hope, and charity. They show the necessity of belief in God and obedience to His commands. They require repentance for sin, baptism by immersion in water by one having divine authority (for the remission of sins through Christ's atonement), and they promise the gift of the Holy Ghost, through the laying on of hands, and all the gifts of that Spirit enjoyed of old. They explain the true order of the church organization and make plain the religion of the Redeemer.

The Book of Mormon gives the history of this continent back to a remote period. It describes the customs and doings of the early inhabitants of the land and traces their origin. It

gives the places of cities, temples, fortifications, and buildings, the ruins of many of which have been discovered since the book was published. It treats of the wars, troubles, division of tribes, their religion, rebellion, travels, triumphs, and tribulations, and forms a study for the archeologist and the antiquarian.

"Mormonism," then, is the pure gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ revealed anew in these latter times. Its advocates are not "Mormons," any more than they are Isaiahs or Ezeiels, Peters or Pauls, for they believe in the Old and New Testaments as well as in the Book of Mormon. Their proper name is Latter-day Saints, in distinction from that of the former-day saints. They claim to have a mission to proclaim the "everlasting gospel to every nation, kindred, tongue, and people," as brought to earth by the angel predicted by John the Divine in the Apocalypse. They gather to places appointed of God as his elect, called from all quarters of the earth. They "seek first the kingdom of God;" that is, His spiritual kingdom set up on the earth for the last days and for the last time, in the "dispensation of the fulness of times," in which all things in Christ are to be gathered in one. The elders of the church go into the world for this purpose, without pay or support other than that voluntarily bestowed by their hearers. They travel "without purse or scrip." They are often despised and rejected. They are men of pure lives, devoted to the welfare of humanity. They are constantly libeled and maligned, but they bear their cross with patience. Their reward comes from above. They invade no man's family. They have no inducements to offer to converts except the blessings that come from obedience to the truth, and a witness from God to each soul that accepts the message of salvation. To these may be added the assurance of persecution and obloquy and in many instances mobocracy and violence.

The "Mormons," or Latter-day Saints, are baptized by one spirit into one body. They are striving to live together in love, and to observe the Golden Rule. They are organized into a compact ecclesiastical body, and are guided by apostles and

prophets, pastors and teachers, and all the ministerial authorities that characterized the primitive Christian Church. These are inspired by divine revelation for the work of the ministry and the perfecting of the saints, and to give counsel and advice to them in all things pertaining to their welfare. But everything in the church has to be done by common consent. The people prosper under the system. They are advised to own the land on which they live and the homes that shelter them. The home is held sacred by the saints as the beginning of their heaven. They rear their families in the fear of God. The song of praise and the voice of prayer are heard in their habitations. They are becoming a power in the earth because of the virtues and the strength of a religion that is intensely spiritual and also eminently practical.

"Mormonism" is for the body as well as for the spirit. It is a religion for to-day. By right living now, its votaries are prepared for the future. By laying a firm foundation in this world, they expect to be able to build upon it in the world to come. No one need fear the spread of "Mormonism," for that means the spread of righteousness and order and peace. It is light in the midst of the darkness of this world. It contains the solution of every religious problem that has vexed and divided Christendom for centuries. It holds for future development the settlement of the conflict between capital and labor. It bears divine authority sent down from heaven in the nineteenth century, and it will not be taken from earth again. It will prepare the way for the coming of the King of kings, whose right it is to reign, and until then its people and their leaders are required to remain "in subjection to the powers that be," to live honoring kings, presidents, magistrates, and municipalities, and to uphold wholesome law wherever they reside.

"Mormonism" will be opposed and fought against, but it will not be overcome. It is of God, not of man. It is vital in every part. It puts down sin and vice and regards lust with abhorrence. It brings its devotees not only to the "unity of the faith," but to concert of purpose and of action. It leads them to individual communion with Deity, and at the same

time to perform their duties to one another on the earth. It promotes industry, thrift, education, progress, the fine arts as well as the common labors of life, and seeks for the acquirement of everything that is useful and beautiful in this world, and the securing of all the highest glories and exaltations in the world to come. "Mormonism" is God's truth manifested to man, and it will endure and conquer and abide forever.

JOSEPH F. SMITH.

Salt Lake City, Utah.



II. PLURAL MARRIAGE IN AMERICA.

THE reply to my article in THE ARENA for August, 1902, by President Joseph F. Smith, of the Utah polygamous church, in the November number of this magazine, makes it plain that "in the earlier days of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints monogamic marriage was advocated and upheld." This was the result of revelation to the church accepted and ratified by solemn assembly August 17, 1835.

The petition for amnesty to the President of the United States, from the Presidency and apostles of the Utah church, stated in regard to plural marriage: "That doctrine was publicly promulgated by our President, the late Brigham Young, forty years ago." This gives as the date of the acceptance of the doctrine August 29, 1852.

No other than the one-wife system of marriage was known or operative in the church during the lifetime of Joseph Smith. President Woodruff stated under oath, March 16, 1892, that he knew of no other law of marriage in the church during the lifetime of Joseph Smith than the one adopted in 1835. In regard to the revelation on polygamy, he stated: "I do not know where the original of the revelation, called the polygamous revelation, is. I never saw a copy of it or the original during the lifetime of Joseph Smith. I do not know whether the church of which I am the President has the purported copy or not."

Lorenzo Snow, a President of the Seventy under Joseph Smith, and living in Nauvoo in 1843, and President of the Apostles in Utah at the time of his testimony, states of this document: "I could not say whether it was after it was presented here by Brigham Young to the church that I saw it. I had not seen it up to that time, of course. I never saw the original."

The statements of William B. Smith, a brother of Joseph Smith, and John E. Page, apostles at Nauvoo, denounced the document as a heresy brought in after the death of Joseph and Hyrum Smith.

James Whitehead, private secretary to Joseph Smith, testified:

"I landed in Nauvoo the 13th day of April, 1842; I lived there until the fall of 1847. I was the private secretary of Joseph Smith from early in June, 1842, until he was killed in 1844. The doctrine of polygamy was never taught by the elders, or high priests, or by any other person or persons of authority in that church so far as I know, or ever heard, between the years 1830 and 1844."

The existence of any secret wife system in the church was publicly denied October 1, 1842, by the following persons prominent in the church: S. Bennett, George Miller, Alpheus Cutler, Reynolds Cahoon, Wilson Law, W. Woodruff, N. K. Whitney, Albert Pettey, Elias Higbee, John Taylor, E. Robinson, and Aaron Johnson; Emma Smith, President of the Relief Society; Elizabeth Ann Whitney, counselor; Sarah M. Cleveland, counselor; Eliza R. Snow, secretary; Mary C. Miller, Lois Cutler, Thirza Cahoon, Ann Hunter, Jane Law, Sophia R. Marks, Polly Z. Johnson, Abigail Works, Catherine Pettey, Sarah Higbee, Phebe Woodruff, Lenora Taylor, Sarah Hillman, Rosanna Marks, and Angeline Robinson. Of this, President Woodruff, one of the men named, stated under oath: "I know all those ladies whose names appear in that certificate. There could not have been any rule of marriage or any order of marriage in existence at that time except that prescribed by the Book of Doctrine and Covenants to their knowledge. They

would certainly have known it, and up to the 1st day of October, 1842, there was no such system taught or practised openly or secretly to my knowledge."

The church was by revelation commanded to keep the law of the land. The Bible, Book of Mormon, and the revelations to the church were by command made the standards of faith and practise.

The contention of the Reorganized Church is this: The laws of God, found in the accepted books of the church, were given to constitute the rules of faith and practise, upon which the church was to be built and perpetuated; as a consequence, nothing could be given to the church that would conflict with the laws he had already given, or that would require the performance of any act by which those laws would be disregarded or broken.

Polygamists, Hedrickites, and the Anti-Mormon League—all, driven from positions that they have taken in their efforts to fasten the charge of polygamy upon Joseph Smith, have resurrected the *Nauvoo Expositor* and taken refuge under this conspiracy of lies. It was an imposition against Joseph Smith—false and slanderous then, and is now.

Emma Smith, the wife of Joseph Smith; William Marks, president of the Stake of Nauvoo and member of the High Council; James Whitehead, the private secretary of Joseph Smith—all standing in such relationship that the things charged could not have been true without their knowledge—ever maintained that the claim made by Brigham Young and his associates touching this document was false.

The document presented by Brigham Young, August 29, 1852, was not identified as the work of Joseph Smith. Of it Brigham Young said: "This revelation has been in my possession many years; and who has known it? None but those who should know it. I keep a patent lock on my desk, and there does not anything leak out that should not. The original copy of this revelation was burnt up; William Clayton was the man who wrote it from the mouth of the Prophet. In the meantime it was in Bishop Whitney's possession. He wished

the privilege to copy it, which Brother Joseph granted. Sister Emma burnt the original."

Mr. Young, however, did not name one of those to whom he refers to support him in the statement. One of the apostles and a President of Seventy who were with him in Nauvoo and Salt Lake City have given their sworn testimony, and neither was among those "who should know it."

William Clayton is introduced to prove the document. The document Brigham had is admitted not to be the one claimed to have been written by Clayton. The connection of Joseph Smith with this purported revelation depends upon the bare assertion of Brigham Young. Upon the publication of this statement of Young's, Mrs. Emma Smith Bidamon was interviewed at her home in Illinois, and her testimony was published during her lifetime. It is as follows:

"Mrs. Bidamon, have you seen the revelation on polygamy published by Orson Pratt, in the *Seer*, in 1852?"

"I have."

"Did you ever see that document in manuscript, previous to its publication by Pratt?"

"I never did."

"Did you see any document of that kind, purporting to be a revelation to authorize polygamy?"

"No; I never did."

"What about that statement of Brigham Young, that you burnt the original manuscript of that revelation?"

"It is false in all its parts, *made out of whole cloth*, without any foundation in truth."

In February, 1879, Mrs. Emma Smith Bidamon gave her statement for publication. She said:

"No such thing as polygamy, or spiritual wifery, was taught publicly or privately, before my husband's death, that I have now, or ever had, any knowledge of."

"Did he not have other wives than yourself?"

"He had no other wife but me; nor did he to my knowledge ever have."

The persons put forward by Joseph F. Smith and his asso-

ciates to identify the polygamous revelation corroborate the position that the document is a forgery. One is Joseph C. Kingsbury, a patron of polygamy, and the other Mercy Rachel Thompson, aunt of Joseph F. Smith, both of Salt Lake City. Neither witness could give a single word from memory of what the original paper contained, but both agreed that the document that they saw was written upon only one or two sheets of foolscap paper. Of this they were positive. Mr. Kingsbury testified:

"The paper I copied. I presume, was copied in an hour; but I could not tell exactly, of course. Yes; I said I copied the revelation on one sheet of paper—foolscap."

Mrs. Mercy Rachel Thompson testified:

"I saw that revelation on polygamy, and had it in my hands—saw what kind of paper it was written on. It was written on foolscap paper. I do not know exactly how many pages there were of it—think there was not more than one whole sheet. If there had been more than one full sheet, I should have known it. I cannot mention anything that was in it. I do not know that the name of Joseph Smith was signed to it."

The document presented by Brigham Young has sixty-six paragraphs, besides the heading, covering eleven pages 8mo printed matter, and could not be copied in long-hand by a fair penman in several hours, nor on one sheet of foolscap paper. If the witnesses produced to prove the existence of this purported revelation testified to the truth, it is a fraud. The witnesses described a different document altogether. Mrs. Bathsheba Smith, wife of George A. Smith, counselor to Brigham Young, also testified. She said, referring to Emma, Joseph Smith's wife:

"There was nobody else held out as his wife while I was living in Nauvoo, nor down to the time of his death. I do not know of any member of the church having more wives than one, at Nauvoo, during the lifetime of Joseph Smith. I lived there from 1840 up to the time he died. I never heard of any such thing. I heard of the John C. Bennett secret-wife doctrine; the church authorities denounced that at the time,

denounced Bennett for that doctrine and cut him off from the church, and preached against it—preached against it publicly right there in the city of Nauvoo, at the time; Joseph Smith and the rest of them—and particularly Joseph Smith—denounced him.”

Of the practise of plural marriage in Joseph Smith's lifetime, Cyrus H. Wheelock, called as a witness by President Woodruff, testified:

“Anybody was liable to be excommunicated or disfellowshipped from the church who attempted to teach the doctrine of plural marriage at that time, up to the death of Joseph Smith. I know that if I had taught it I would be liable to be excommunicated mighty quick. I never heard of the ceremony of plural marriage performed in Nauvoo before the death of Joseph Smith. Joseph Smith said in 1844, when he was denouncing the John C. Bennett secret-wife system, that there was no such system, as that introduced or practised by John C. Bennett, taught or practised in the church, and that the teaching and practising of it would take the people who practised it *to hell*.”

This shows, by polygamists themselves, the attitude of Joseph Smith to have been against polygamy up to the time of his death. That polygamy may have been practised in Nauvoo by John C. Bennett and others, and that it made inroads upon the flock despite the efforts of Joseph Smith made against it, both in public and in private, may be true.

William Marks, President of the Stake and of the High Council in Nauvoo, in a letter dated Shabbona, DeKalb County, Illinois, October 23, 1859, gives the attitude of Joseph Smith toward polygamy just a few days before his death. He wrote:

“I will give his words verbatim, for they are indelibly stamped upon my mind. He said he had desired for a long time to have a talk with me on the subject of polygamy. He said it eventually would prove the overthrow of the church, and we should soon be obliged to leave the United States unless it could be speedily put down. He was satisfied that it was a cursed doctrine, and that there must be every exertion made

to put it down. He said that he would go before the congregation and proclaim against it, and I must go into the High Council, and he would prefer charges against those in transgression, and I must sever them from the church unless they made ample satisfaction. There was much more said, but this was the substance. The mob commenced to gather about Carthage in a few days after; therefore, there was nothing done concerning it."

Here in private he called it a "cursed doctrine," agreeing with the public statements testified to by Cyrus H. Wheelock and Bathsheba Smith. This is a refutation of the charge that Joseph Smith was in polygamy. How could he prefer charges against those in transgression, and "have them severed from the church," if he was himself guilty?

Parties misrepresent the Reorganized Church by using a letter written by Isaac Sheen and published in the *Saints' Herald* (vol. i., p. 27), claiming from this that the church has changed position upon the question since the year 1860. If these men are looking for the truth, why do they not examine the testimony of William Marks, found on the opposite page? William Marks is a witness stating what he knows. Isaac Sheen was not a witness; he knew nothing about the facts personally, and simply wrote a letter arguing the matter, taking the statement made by Brigham Young in 1852, "that the revelation was burnt," as one basis. The letter was written to the *Saturday Evening Post*, October 9, 1852, and published before Isaac Sheen was a member of the Reorganized Church. It was afterward published as a clipping in the *Saints' Herald*, but shows in no way whatever the attitude of the church upon the question, nor of any of its leading officers.

The enemies of Joseph Smith in Nauvoo and elsewhere had a remedy at hand, if he had violated the laws of the State, that would have been as ineffectual to Joseph Smith as a like procedure would have been to Paul had he brought a suit for slander in the courts of Judea or Rome, notwithstanding the fact that he was pressed daily with the most slanderous lies. These enemies were not only willing to use voluntary witnesses who

knew anything, but actually suborned witnesses to try to convict him upon false accusations. If those whom Joseph Smith had severed from the church knew anything, they had means of redress through the courts. The general prejudice against Joseph Smith and the "sect everywhere spoken against" was such as to close redress to him through the courts, as it did to the friends of Colonel Owen Lovejoy, the abolitionist, who was shot down in the streets of Alton, Ill. That this was not done by those who claimed to have so much proof in the attack by the *Nauvoo Expositor* places the matter beyond controversy that the attack was by those who were angry because they had been severed from the church, and were determined to ruin the man who had been prominent in accomplishing it.

The *Expositor* was issued June 7, 1844. Complaints had been filed at the May term of court against Joseph Smith; he appeared in court upon these complaints and demanded trial; the prosecution was not ready and the causes were deferred till the October term. Twenty days from the issue of the *Expositor* Joseph Smith was killed. What opportunity did this period of twenty days afford him to prosecute for slander those who made allegations in that paper of wrongdoing on his part, when no names are signed to the articles, nor specific items of identification given in the paper itself to show who were responsible for the slanderous assertions? Those who now assert that Joseph Smith should have appealed to the courts for redress if he were slandered show much ignorance of the facts and the conditions existing at the time.

To contradict Mrs. Emma Smith in her denial of consenting to or having knowledge of her husband marrying a second wife, the affidavits of Emily D. P. Young and Eliza R. Snow Young, wives of Brigham Young, Eliza M. Lyman, Lucy W. Kimball, William Clayton, *et al.*, all polygamists, are published in *Historical Record* (Utah), pp. 219 to 234, and the 11th day of May, 1843, is fixed as the day when Emma Smith gave two in one day to her husband; and but for the fact that Joseph Smith during his lifetime had kept a private journal, recording the transactions of each day, Mrs. Smith would have been at the

mercy of these conspirators. It is remarkable that Joseph Smith should be able to record himself in condemnation of polygamy through his writings upon an issue made twenty-five years after his death. His private journal was consulted, and contained the following:

"Thursday, the 11th day of May, 1843.—At six A. M. baptized Louisa Beeman, Sarah Alley, and others. At 8 A. M. went to see a new carriage made by Thomas Moore, which was ready for travel. Emma went to Quincy in new carriage. I rode out as far as Prairie. At 10 A. M. B. Young, H. C. Kimball, P. P. Pratt, O. Pratt, O. Hyde, W. Woodruff, Geo. A. Smith, John Taylor, and W. Richards assembled in council and voted that Addison Pratt, Noah Rogers, Benjamin F. Grouard, and Knowlton F. Hanks go on a mission to the Pacific Isles. Captain Dan Jones prepared himself to take a mission to Wales; James Sloan to go to Ireland; Reuben Headlock, John Cairns, and Samuel James to England; and that Reuben Headlock preside over the church, etc., be assisted by elders Hiram Clark and Thomas Ward. That the brothers Cairns go to Scotland."

These and other council proceedings occupied the day. The journal further states that Emma returned from Quincy May 15th. This confirms the statement of the wife of the prophet.

The teachings of the Bible, Book of Mormon, and the revelations given to the church were to govern and control until Christ's second coming. These teachings are binding on all Latter-day Saints. They are in favor of monogamy and opposed to polygamy. There is no provision for a change in the law to govern the domestic relation. Those who assert that there is use subterfuges too glaring to be credited.

It is held by Utah polygamists and adopted by anti-Mormons that the statement in the Book of Mormon, "For if I will, saith the Lord of hosts, raise up seed unto me, I will command my people: otherwise, they shall hearken unto these things," is to be taken as meaning that God would at some time thereafter give a command authorizing polygamy. That this is clearly erroneous is shown by what preceded those words: "Where-

fore, saith the Lord, I have led this people forth out of the land of Jerusalem . . . that I might raise up unto me a righteous branch from the fruit of the loins of Joseph." The commandment was monogamic, and agrees with Genesis ii. 24, Malachi ii. 15, and the command given the church in 1831: "Marriage is ordained of God unto man; wherefore it is lawful that he should have one wife, and they twain shall be one flesh."

Joseph Smith could not have either taught or practised contrary to this rule of marriage. To have done so he would have disregarded and disobeyed the commands of the Lord, as he and his associates understood them. The evidence that he did this is lacking or altogether inadequate. It is proof that no children were born to him except by his wife Emma. The chief contention of the Reorganized Church and the sons of the prophet Joseph Smith is not that he was not a polygamist, but that the dogma and practise are contrary to Scripture, ancient and modern, and wrong—being also contrary to the law of God and the institutions of the United States.

For the religious enemies of Mormonism to read into its declarations of faith parenthetic explanations and conjectural statements as assumed facts, and to interweave into the citations from its articles of faith and its sacred books misstatements and mischievous allusions foreign to the text, is a work unchristian in motive and false in argument; and yet this is the method employed by the sectaries opposed to the church in Utah and the Reorganized Church alike, on the ground that, having common origin, both are bad. It is an unworthy method, and cannot succeed; its animus defeats itself.

God having by creation provided for an approximate equality of the sexes in number, the males in excess, to counteract the loss in strenuous life, the revelation authorizing polygamy commands an impossibility, or creates special favor to the few against the many, contrary to the gospel of Christ; hence, it cannot be from God.

JOSEPH SMITH.

Lamoni, Iowa.

III. ORIGIN OF AMERICAN POLYGAMY.

MORMONISM is a subject of perennial interest. It appeals to the imagination and presents many intricate historical problems. One of the most important concerns the origin of American polygamy. Was it from God, from Joseph Smith, or from Brigham Young? From the ranks of Mormonism comes a babel of conflicting answers. Some say from God, through Smith the prophet; some from the devil, through Smith the apostate; others, led by Smith's own son, from the devil, through Brigham Young the impostor. This babel has recently found expression in THE ARENA. The son of the "prophet" first stated his view and gave his reasons therefor. He is the head of the *Reorganized Church*. He was answered by Joseph F. Smith, the leader of the Utah Mormons, who held strenuously to the view that polygamy came from God through Joseph the prophet.

That neither advocate lacks witnesses is certainly a notable feature of the discussion. So much contradictory testimony, from men and women *who should know*, seems very confusing. We would naturally expect a discernible preponderance of testimony. That we do not find it is in complete accord with what have been conceded to be the facts of Mormon history by all historians other than Mormons.

Joseph Smith, the "seer," was a practical polygamist both at Kirtland and in Missouri; *i.e.*, as opportunity offered, he enjoyed the "blessings of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." A few shared his confidence and partook with him of the "blessings." Thus he prepared the way for the "revelation." At Nauvoo he continued this characteristic policy, even after the "revelation" had come. Double dealing while surrounded by opposing and indignant Gentiles, and in a church but partly prepared for a reign of lust, was an absolute necessity. On subjects of high spiritual import, like the number of Joseph's *liaisons*, the Gentile had no right to the truth, and the "weak brother" was "unable to receive it." Not till Young had safely conducted "Zion" to far-away Utah was the truth avowed.

Some of Smith's associates knew him to be a polygamist; others thought he was not. The Utah Mormons must at once admit that they pursued this policy.

In 1850, John Taylor, who at the time had ten wives, publicly denied polygamy. He only did what all had done for years. Hyrum Smith, like Taylor, denied it. An elder had been disciplined for teaching it, and a circular letter, signed by the Utah clique, declared that no such thing was taught in Nauvoo. But how about the Reorganized Church and the prophet's son? Must they admit that this policy was characteristic of the early church? In the first number of the *Saints' Herald*, their official organ, we find the following: "Joseph Smith repented of his connection with this doctrine and said it was from the devil. He caused the revelation on that subject to be burnt. When he voluntarily came back to Nauvoo and surrendered himself into the hands of his enemies, he said he was going to Carthage to die. At that time he also said that if it had not been for that accursed spiritual wife doctrine he would never have come to that." The same paper says: "The death of the prophet is a fact that has been realized, although he repented of the iniquity and abhorred it before his death."

Relying on the lapse of time and the contradictory things told about it, the church over which the son presides has made a remarkable change of front in the matter of the father's connection with "that accursed doctrine." They evidently stood just where the Utah Mormons do on the connection of Smith with the "revelation," and of course were compelled to admit that his protests against it were a sham. But the son lays great stress on the Book of Mormon as an evidence of the father's innocence. It is to be feared that he stops reading before the "Lord" has ceased to speak. It enjoins chastity upon a fictitious people living in America 500 B. C. It then leaps over twenty-three centuries, lands some place near the Smith cabin, in western New York, and says: "For if I will, saith the Lord of hosts, raise up seed unto me [when Joseph wants a chance at the "blessings of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob"], I will com-

mand my people [July 12, 1843]: otherwise [i.e., if Joseph does not give the "revelation"] they shall hearken to these things [the commands against polygamy given to the fictitious Nephites]." (Lamoni edition, p. 116.) By the insertion of these parentheses we can see that the sentence that the Lamoni chieftain *always* omits is strikingly in harmony with the facts. Chastity is the fiction; the "blessings" are the real thing.

Let us hear a witness from Nauvoo—one that Joseph suppressed by violence. Had the witness not told the truth the courts were open for lawful redress: "We hope many items of doctrine as now taught, some of which, however, are taught secretly and denied openly, and others publicly, considerate men will treat with contempt. We are earnestly seeking to explode the vicious principles of Joseph Smith and those who practise the same abominations and whoredoms." (Nauvoo *Expositor*, June 7, 1844.) Joseph had evidently been after the "blessings."

As we have charged that the early Mormons were guilty of duplicity in reference to polygamy, it is now in point to raise the question as to whether they ever practised misrepresentation in anything else. If they did, the position is much strengthened. If the matter is of great importance and involves the prophet, it presents an insuperable objection to the religion that he founded, whether we look upon his son or his nephew as its real exponent.

Smith's early "revelations" were sent to the printing house in Missouri to be printed. Before they were bound into books the establishment was wrecked, and most of the printed matter on hand destroyed. Several complete copies of the "revelations" were saved, however, and bound as the Book of Commandments. One of these is accessible to the writer. Two years later the "revelations" were reprinted as the Book of Doctrine and Covenants. Many startling changes had occurred in the "word of the Lord to my servant Joseph." For instance, the expression, "I will consecrate the riches of the Gentiles unto my people," becomes "For I will consecrate the riches of those who embrace my gospel among the Gentiles

to the poor of my people." "Consecrating" the riches of the Gentiles was a costly experiment. The "Lord" had to get out of it some way, and Joseph was not the man to let the "Lord" come to grief. The point, however, is this: in saving the "Lord," Joseph had to give "my people" false revelations in the place of the true ones. The false are the ones they have to this day. There is evident duplicity here. If they would misrepresent the "word of the Lord," does any one doubt that they would tell things contrary to the facts when their sins were in question? Let it be remembered that these changes are numerous and far-reaching so far as the practical teaching of Joseph was concerned.

Let us now examine another case. Shortly after the Book of Mormon came forth its advocates put it forward, in their efforts to make converts, very much more than they do now. They soon had a system of evidences by which its high claims were vindicated. Several works were written on the subject, but the one that had, perhaps, the greatest circulation of them all is a tract written by Parley P. Pratt, one of the first quorum of apostles. It is called "A Voice of Warning." It is circulated to this day by both the Utah and Reorganized churches, and is pronounced by the latter organization to be perhaps the best work for instruction in the gospel, considering its size and cheapness, that has ever been put forth. It assails the ministry of the evangelical churches as priests "who preach for hire and divine for money, and who receive their authority from their fellow-men." It calls for men "who take not the honor upon themselves, but are called as was Aaron." "Apostle" Pratt was evidently that kind of a man, if we allow him to state his own credentials, and he claimed the same thing for his associates.

The fourth chapter is devoted in part to the Book of Mormon. It tells of its wonderful discovery and the startling events that attended it. A careful argument then follows in which he shows it to be in accord with the traditions of the American Indians, whose ancestors and kinsmen are supposed to have written it. In this argument is the following quotation

from Dr. Boudinot, author of "A Star in the West": "It is said among their principal or beloved men that they have it handed down from their ancestors that *such a book as* the white people have was once theirs; that while they had it they prospered exceedingly, etc." Dr. Boudinot says, in the passage quoted, "that *the book which* the white people have was once theirs." *The book* is the Bible. *Such a book as*, according to Pratt, would be the Book of Mormon. The reason for the change is evident. "Etc.," in the quotation, represents the following: "but that the white people bought it of them, and learnt many things from it; while the Indians lost their credit, offended the great spirit, and suffered exceedingly from the neighboring nations." The omitted section says that the Indian tradition claims that the Indians had the *very book* which the white people have. So far as Mr. Pratt gave us this quotation 102 words are right. (Only the altered portion is used in this article.) Three are changed. The change is altogether in the direction of the writer's interest.

Another quotation from Boudinot is found on the following page. The first half of it, consisting of 47 words, is exactly right. Then follows: "There is a tradition related by an aged Indian of the Stockbridge tribe that their fathers were once in possession of a 'Sacred Book,' *which was handed down from generation to generation and at last hid in the earth*, since which time they have been under the feet of their enemies. But those oracles were to be restored to them again, and then they would triumph over their enemies, and regain their ancient country, together with their rights and privileges." This agrees with the first excerpt from Boudinot as amended by Pratt. If we take the passage as it occurs in "A Star in the West," this flatly contradicts it. How can we explain it? Easily. Search Boudinot from cover to cover and the "Sacred Book" section cannot be found. Pratt was helping the "Lord" out (of course it is Joseph's Lord) by manufacturing some testimony to sustain his book. Is it a misrepresentation? What else can it be? It is untrue, and it is impossible for it to be a mistake. Too many things are quoted accurately to allow

even for a moment that this is a lapse of memory. It is rather a lapse of morals.

This happened as early as 1839; yet Joseph Smith never re-proved it. The "Lord" should certainly have told him of the sin of his apostle, but he never did so. Joseph died without anything so creditable to his prophetic office occurring; and his successors in office, whether they sit at Lamoni or Salt Lake City, have to this time failed to make any correction. And they are "inspired." *So was Brother Pratt.* Again we may ask, Was the early Mormon church ever guilty of duplicity? Who can deny it? If they would deceive the people about the Book of Mormon, they would do the same thing about the "blessings."

The logic of the situation, as pitiless as death and as remorseless as fate, drives us to the following conclusions:

1. Joseph Smith was the author of the "revelation" on polygamy. He both taught it and practised it. His sole authority was his own lusts. It is blasphemy to say that it came from God; it is false to lay it at the door of Brigham Young. He may have enjoyed the "blessings" as much as did Joseph, but he did not originate either the Mormon religion or the practise of polygamy.

2. He (Smith) tried to deceive many of the Mormons about it, and all of the Gentiles. This accounts for the fact that the Mormons are divided on the question. It will also explain the apparent strength of the arguments made by the respective heads of the Mormon churches. It was positively affirmed by the Nauvoo *Expositor*.

3. The foregoing conclusion is emphasized by the fact that the policy of deception was also employed in two instances in which it vitally affects that which they claim to be the word of God. They changed the "revelations" given by Smith, yet left his followers to believe that they were the same. They deliberately manufactured evidences to prove the truth of the Book of Mormon and circulate the forged testimony to this day. These instances have been selected for two reasons. The first is that they strike a blow at the sacred books of the Mormons

while establishing the fact of Smith's double-dealing. The second is that the proof is found in documents—unbiased, feelingless, and unprejudiced, as the living witness can never be. Boudinot's book has no ill will toward the Mormons. It says to-day just what it said eighty-seven years ago. The same may be said of the other works quoted. They are most of them what the Mormons made them.

4. The battle between the Smiths is a noisy and demonstrative sham. They may be earnest enough, but there is nothing in it, after all is said in their favor that we can possibly say. It is merely a contest between two religious delusions to determine which has the right to claim descent from another delusion. To one who appreciates the merits of the case the story of a certain small boy is in point. He was to watch the freaks in a museum, and report if anything went wrong. Directly he came running to the showman, excited and breathless. When he was able to express himself he cried: "Mister! Mister! The two-headed monster is a-fightin' with herself, and a pullin' out all of her hair!" Long may she fight!

JOHN T. BRIDWELL.

Trimble, O.

THE MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP CONVENTION.

[*Staff Correspondence.*]

THE "National Convention on Municipal Ownership and Public Franchises," held in New York February 25 to 27, 1903, under the auspices of the New York Reform Club, was one of the most important gatherings, if not the most important, that has yet taken place in this field of economic and political science.

Among the attractive things in the program were: (1) the addresses of Clinton Rogers Woodruff, secretary of the National Municipal League, and Mayor Head of Nashville, Tenn., on the political influence of franchise corporations; (2) the debates on gas and electric lighting, with Lt. Cahoon, secretary and ex-president of the National Electric Lighting Association, J. E. Lockwood, president of the Michigan Electric Company of Detroit, and H. L. Doherty, past president of the Ohio Gas Light Association and President of the Denver Gas Light Company, on the one side, and Professor E. W. Bemis, of Cleveland, E. B. Ellicott, city electrician for Chicago, Victor Rosewater, editor of the *Omaha Daily Bee*, F. F. Ingram, commissioner of electric lighting in Detroit, and Mr. Bellamy of Liverpool on the other; (3) the discussion on the telephone between U. N. Bethell, general superintendent of the New York Telephone Company, and Professor Frank Parsons of Boston, president of the National Public Ownership League, and the contest over municipal ownership of street railways, etc., in England, between Chas. J. Yerkes, street railway magnate of Philadelphia, Chicago, New York, and London fame, and R. P. Porter, director of the eleventh census of the United States, for private ownership, and C. R. Bellamy, general manager of the Municipal Tramways of Liverpool, Robert Donald, editor

of the *Municipal Journal* of London, and Mayor Urquhart of Toronto, in favor of municipal ownership; (4) contributions of special interest relating to the history of municipal ownership in the United States by Professor Haskins, dean of the New York University School of Commerce, Professor Meade and Professor Rowe of the University of Pennsylvania, William Wirt Howe of New Orleans, former president of the American Bar Association, and L. N. Case, manager of the Duluth water and lighting plants; Massachusetts' experiences in the regulation of street railways, by Louis D. Brandeis of Boston; the necessity of municipal ownership to secure due coördination of public service, by the Hon. John De Witt Warner, president of the New York Art Commission; the regulation of public service corporations, by Allen Riply Foote, editor of *Public Policy*, and John R. Commons, secretary of the Taxation Commission of the National Civic Federation; the taxation of franchise values, by Professor Seligman of Columbia University and Senator John Ford of New York; (5) recent German experiences with municipal ownership, by Dr. Heyn of Berlin, and the results of municipalizing the water supply, by W. R. Hill, ex-president of the American Water Works Association; and (6), last but not least, the discussion of the initiative and referendum in their relation to municipal ownership, by George H. Shibley of Washington, chairman of the National Federation for Majority Rule, Eltwed Pomeroy of Newark, president of the National Direct Legislation League, and Professor Parsons of the Massachusetts Referendum League.

Among the delegates not on the list of speakers were Professor John Graham Brooks of Harvard University, Professor Dyer of Vanderbilt University, Mayor Sullivan of Hartford, and Professor Hawkins of Syracuse University.

* * *

The impromptu discussions were often quite as fine as the prepared addresses. Two or three of the speakers on electric lighting spent too much time going into details that should have been left for the printed page; and one nice old gentle-

man, left over from a past geologic epoch, treated the assembly to a long harangue about the lunatics (of which the convention was full) who did not have sense enough to know that the principles of liberty, democracy and true limitation of governmental functions were positively opposed to municipal ownership. But for the most part the time of the meetings was well spent and the results were extraordinarily valuable.

Of the statements of practical results and personal experience, the speeches of Mr. Ingram of Detroit, Mr. Bellamy of Liverpool, and Mayor Urquhart of Toronto met with the most enthusiastic approval; and of the more comprehensive discussions the arguments of Professor Parsons of Boston and Dr. Donald of England received the most attention and applause, which indicates a supra-fiscal attitude on the part of the convention, since these addresses were the two that, though dealing strongly with the financial side of the question, placed the main emphasis on the ethical, social, and political reasons for public ownership.

Mr. Ingram said: "Detroit's municipal electric street lighting plant has been in operation seven years, being founded in 1895 by the late Governor Pingree, then mayor of Detroit. It is the largest municipal plant in the country except in Chicago. It is managed by a non-salaried commission of six appointed by the mayor and confirmed by the council, one member retiring each year. On contract with private companies, Detroit paid from \$240 to \$128 per 2,000-c. p. arc light per year. The last contract was at the rate of \$132. Under municipal ownership the total cost, including interest, depreciation, and taxes, was \$100 the first year (much under \$100 if allowance is made for expenditures really relating to other service than street lights and other items not fairly attributable to the arcs), and has steadily declined to \$63 in 1902. As a mere business proposition the municipal plant has proved a good investment for Detroit. In three years more the plant will have paid for itself, and the city will have a plant worth \$800,000, and the service too, for \$160,000 less than the service alone would have cost at the lowest obtainable bid for a ten-year contract—\$102 per arc; so that

the city will be about one million dollars better off than with private lighting—an aggregate saving to the people of about \$1,000,000 in ten years by the public ownership of a street-lighting system only, without the advantage of supplying commercial lights to private consumers, which would still further reduce the cost and increase the savings of municipal ownership. A great improvement of the service has resulted. For instance, the number of lamp hours reported 'out' the last year of contract lighting was 86,426, while last year under municipal lighting it was but 6,826, with 50 per cent. more lamps burning.

"Detroit's public plant pays union wages and runs on the eight-hour day. The permanency of employment is shown by the fact that 38 per cent. of the present employees have been in the service since the start in 1895; 59 per cent. since 1898, and 76 per cent. since 1900. Machine politics and superfluous employees have found no opportunity in this public utility. In the history of the Detroit Commission there have been but three politicians out of thirteen appointments, and they have each resigned after a brief service, because, according to their own statements, they found that their prestige as politicians suffered, as there was no opportunity to reward their political followers. The civil service rules of the system prevented any spoils or 'patronage,' but the politicians could not make their constituents understand that they were powerless to reward them with positions on the electric service, and so they could not afford to remain on the board—a sort of automatic purging of the political element resulting from the establishment of a civil service organized on business principles."

Mr. Bellamy, manager of the Liverpool street railways, stated that "when the city took the roads it tore out the old plant at once and put in an electrical equipment, greatly improved the speed, comfort, and safety of the service, raised wages, and cut fares about one-half. The enterprise is worth \$5,000,000 more than its capitalization, and in twenty-five years the debt will be entirely extinguished. The tramways pay a large sum each year in reduction of local taxes; yet over a million is saved to the people in lower fares each year. The

fares now are two cents in the old city, and four cents beyond. Ninety per cent. of the passengers pay the two-cent fare. About \$200,000 a year, or one-third of the total wage payment, represents the direct gain of the employees through municipal ownership. It would have cost \$200,000 less if we had worked the men the same hours and paid the same wages as the private company did, so that in hours and wages the men have gained an equivalent of about 50 per cent. So much the city has willingly given, and the men are entirely satisfied. In respect to the question whether the men might not combine to secure undue advance of wages through political action, the management has no fear of any such thing; and the labor representatives in the councils representing outside labor would object to having the wages of the tram-men raised too much above the general level of wages outside."

Mr. Yerkes's paper contained the following luminous remarks: "Municipal control should rarely exist. All business interests should be taken hold of intelligently. How ridiculous to suppose a municipality could manage a railway economically or wisely! No doubt private ownership can be abused; but what cannot be? No matter what the abuses have been as related to the country, it is far ahead of anything like municipal control."

Mayor Urquhart of Toronto said he belonged to the minority party, but he was elected on a public ownership platform. There was a very strong sentiment in favor of municipal ownership, not only among workingmen and small business men but even among large business men, the vice-president of the Board of Commerce being one of the strongest advocates of it. "Toronto owns her water-works and recently cut the rates in two, supplying an ordinary six-roomed house, with bath, etc., for \$2.40 a year; an eight-roomed house for \$3.60; a ten-roomed house for \$4.20, and a small house with one faucet for \$1 a year." Toronto owns the street railways and has leased them on terms that he said had been pronounced by Professor Parsons and other experts to be the best yet made between a city and a company. Under these terms the company pays the

city \$800 a year for each mile of single track, plus 8 per cent. of the gross receipts up to one million dollars; 10 per cent. between one million and one and a half million; 12 per cent. between two million and three million; and 20 per cent. on all above three million, which means over 15 per cent. of the total income of the company. Besides this, twenty-five tickets must be sold for one dollar, or six for a quarter, workingmen's tickets eight for a quarter (or a little over three cents a ride), and school children's ten for a quarter, or two and one-half cents a ride. The city also regulates the treatment of employees, has large control over the service and the book-keeping, and audits the company's accounts every month. Toronto also owns the cattle market and wharves and is the largest owner of real estate in the city, leasing part of it in the business part of the city and along the water front at good rentals. There is a movement now for a municipal telephone exchange.

* * *

Fine as these statements were, the highest notes of the convention were struck in the following passages from the addresses of Professor Parsons and Dr. Donald.

"Public ownership is higher in the scale of civilization," said Professor Parsons, "than ownership by a private corporation. The history of civilization is the history of the growth of co-operation in ever-widening circles, till at last the all-inclusive circle of public ownership is reached. All the functions of government were first private, then public, as civilization grew. Public ownership means a fuller harmony, a completer unity, a higher integration—a union of all for the benefit of all in place of a union of part against the rest. A private corporation is itself a step in the process of crystallization, which will not be complete in respect to any public utility till the little corporation melts into the big one. Public ownership is simply a further step in the progress toward the complete organization of industry of which the corporations are partial and undeveloped forms—an organization which it is to be hoped may become complete by the development of the public ownership of monopolies and utilities like education and fire service, the due

diffusion of which is too vital to be left to private enterprise, and the growth and federation of coöperative industry in commerce, manufactures, and agriculture. *Too much attention is given to the financial side of the question.* Days and weeks are spent in proving that public ownership saves money or the contrary. Such arguments cannot be conclusive. A method or institution might save money, and yet be inferior in respect to far more important considerations; or it might fail to make money and yet be best in the light of the higher tests. The over-worship of money is the fault of our age. It is of prime importance that the commercial astigmatism of the times should be corrected, so that social questions may be viewed in their true proportions and relations. *The fundamental test of any institution, method, or service is its effect on the public good—its relation to morals, manhood, government, industry, civilization, and progress; and in applying this vital test the principal emphasis must be placed, not on financial results, but on human rights. Character and human development, happy homes and noble lives are the real ends for which telephones and street railways and all other institutions—industrial, political, and social—exist; and only so far as they conduce to those ends is their existence justified.*"

Professor Parsons then applied both financial and social tests and cited clusters of facts and diagrams full of data showing that public telephone plants aim at service, while private systems aim at private profit; that public systems keep their capitalizations down to actual values or below; that they make lower rates than private exchanges in the same locality; that they offer greater facilities and secure a wider use of the 'phone than private companies in the same country or city, give labor better wages and shorter hours, secure absolute economies through the absence of legislative expenses and through the higher efficiency of better paid labor, etc., put the profits into the public treasury instead of into the pockets of rich men, so aiding the diffusion of wealth, favor political purity by removing the main cause of municipal corruption—the franchise corporations, and, by transferring the financial interests of wealthy

and influential stockholders to the side of good government and honest administration, remove the antagonism of interest between the owners and the public, which is the tap-root of the evils of private monopoly, and lift the relationship of men to a higher plane by replacing the low relations of conflict and mastery with the higher relations of partnership and devotion.

General Manager Bethell stated that, in France, Switzerland, and other European countries having public telephones, the telephone wages, service, and development were inferior to ours, and compared the number of telephones in Manhattan and Bronx boroughs of New York City with the number in Berlin. Professor Parsons replied that it was not fair to compare American exchanges with those of Europe in order to test the value of public ownership, for the difference might be due to dissimilarity in energy, push, and general civilization. America was far ahead of Europe in matters that were private on both sides of the sea. The true comparison was between public and private ownership in the same country or city. He had personally inspected the telephone systems in most of the countries of Europe, and found the best public systems vastly superior to the private service in England. In France, Switzerland, Austria, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, and parts of Great Britain, where public telephones had followed private exchanges, wages had been increased, the service greatly improved and extended, and the rates much reduced. It was also unfair to compare the business heart of New York with the whole of Berlin. If the whole of New York were compared with the whole of Berlin, the German city showed the greater telephone development.

We have reserved for the last what was really the greatest contest of the convention—the discussion of the success or failure of municipal ownership in Great Britain. In England, where more than half the gas is supplied by municipalities, and more than half the mileage of the street railways is owned by the cities, the rapid advance of municipalization has alarmed the corporations and they have instituted a crusade against

municipal ownership, partly through that time-honored organ of capital and conservatism, the *Times*, and partly through an organization called the Industrial Freedom League, started by the directors of a large electric combine with the frank acknowledgment that they intend to protect their own and kindred interests against the public ownership movement. Besides sending out pamphlets and speakers, they secure articles and letters arguing against municipal ownership printed in the newspapers, and pay for them at so much a line. Mr. Yerkes has taken American methods to England, and they have found a congenial soil. The Hon. Robert P. Porter, known to those familiar with census affairs as one of the greatest magicians with figures who have been privileged to tangle up and untwist in their own peculiar way the data of a national census, is now in England, a member of the council of the Industrial Freedom League, and working vigorously in the interests of the corporations. This gentleman submitted to the convention a voluminous statement—about 14,000 words—to prove that municipal ownership in Great Britain is a failure, since, according to his contention, local taxation is increasing and municipal indebtedness growing; public ownership is not progressive, and more profits can be realized with private ownership, or with municipal plants leased to companies, than with municipal ownership and operation:

"There is no reason why municipalities, if managed with the same economies, should not sell gas cheaper than private companies; but municipal traders have never been able to prove that they did. In exhibiting the exhilarating results of municipal trading, numerous comparative tables are prepared, showing the low price of gas and electricity in a city where the municipality owns and operates the plants, and the high price of the same in cities where the plants are owned and operated by wicked companies. As a rule these comparisons are worthless, for they do not take into account, for example, some little factors like the price of coal, which makes all the difference in the world in the cost of electric light or gas. The reduction in price of gas made by private companies in England has been

as great, if not greater, and as a rule the price charged under exactly similar conditions is less, than by municipalities. In short, in England, as elsewhere, the private companies have set the pace in enterprise, quality, and price of gas. In a recent official inquiry these facts were clearly brought out. It was shown that all enterprise in the gas industry has come from companies, because the companies have greater motive for enterprise. The municipalities may follow private enterprise, but they never have been known to lead.

"The advocates of municipal trading claim that in the case of electric lighting 'the superiority of public ownership is remarkable.' It would take a better quality of electric light than that supplied by most of the British municipalities for one to see this superiority; that is, if the comparison is to be made between the company-supplied light of the United States and the municipalized electric lighting of Great Britain. If the quality and cost of electric light is no better than that produced by American methods under private ownership, then I see no advantage in municipal ownership of electric light.

"As we have seen, most of the advantages of municipal trading have, during the last few years, been exploded. Sound commercial firms in England pay no more for their capital. It has been demonstrated over and over again that a municipality can do the work no cheaper. No one familiar with the facts will contend that a town council constantly changing its membership is a better business board of management than the board of directors of a successful company. There is no proof that the consumer is specially benefited. The service is equally good in the United States under private enterprise, and the cost of labor and of raw material no more.

"It has been my endeavor to discuss the subject assigned me on its business merits, and the conclusion seems to be that municipal trading *does not pay*. There is, however, another view of the subject that has been very strongly brought out by the *London Times*; namely, that 'municipal enterprise' and 'progressive municipalism' are really being made the stepping-stones to the Collective State."

Mr. Porter also spent much time in explaining the dangers arising from the increase of debt due to "the great development of municipal ownership in connection with the tramways. The London County Council owns 72 miles of line, 48 miles of which, situated on the north side of the Thames, are at present worked by the North Metropolitan Tramways Company; while the 24 miles on the south side of the Thames, purchased January, 1899, are worked by the Council itself.

"The outcome of the various investigations conducted by the County Council have resulted in that body taking up, in a practical way, the tramways of London, and, if the present policy is adhered to, in a few years the county of London will be the undisputed owner of all tramways within its border; and not only is it the policy to absorb existing tramways, but to operate them. The last available Board of Trade report on Tramways for the year ending March, 1901, shows that there were 99 municipal street railways in the country, with a mileage of 700 miles; the capital expenditure upon these was over \$70,000,000. The companies had 114 undertakings, with a mileage of 616 miles and a capital expenditure of over \$52,000,000. Long before Great Britain is adequately supplied with electric street railways, the capital account will have increased to five hundred million dollars."

In reply Dr. Donald showed that there were two kinds of debt—one representing the burden of past expenditure without present assets to show for it, the other representing existing assets. "The assets of municipalities in Great Britain outweigh their liabilities, and over 35 per cent. of outstanding loans are borrowed for undertakings which are of a productive character and profitable investments for the community. Instead of increasing taxation, municipal ownership has diminished it. The following table shows the extent to which rates were relieved last year in a number of towns from municipal undertakings after all charges, interest, and sinking fund payments had been met:

TOWN.	AMOUNT OF RELIEF IN THE £.		TOWN.	AMOUNT OF RELIEF IN THE £.	
	s.	d.		s.	d.
Barrow.....	0	10	Liverpool.....	0	8
Bath.....	0	10	Macclesfield.....	1	2½
Blackpool.....	0	9	Nottingham.....	1	2
Bradford.....	0	4½	Oldham.....	0	9
Burnley.....	0	6¾	Preston.....	0	9
Darlington.....	1	8¾	Rochdale.....	0	9¾
Derby.....	0	9	Stafford.....	1	3¾
Dewsbury.....	0	7	Stockport.....	0	8¾
Hull.....	1	3½	Stockton.....	0	6
Lancaster.....	0	11	Warrington.....	0	7
Leicester.....	0	11	Wigan.....	1	7¾

"Such increase of local taxation as has occurred has not been due to the municipalization of street railways, gas, or electric plants, but to the reorganization of local government in recent years, with heavy expenditures for schools, roads, bridges, asylums, hospitals, and sanitation.

"The following table shows the comparative growth of municipal and company tramways:

	MUNICIPALITIES.			COMPANIES.		
	No.	Capital Expended.	Mileage.	No.	Capital Expended.	Mileage.
1882-3.....	28	£ 2,227,192	170½	113	£ 7,523,635	501
1888-9.....	29	2,959,633	243¾	125	10,704,958	706¼
1892-3.....	35	3,105,636	274¾	118	10,998,516	686¼
1896-7.....	42	4,459,488	367¾	117	10,405,622	663½
1897-8.....	47	6,116,687	450	116	10,376,282	614
1898-9.....	61	8,134,530	519½	108	10,468,692	602½
1899-1900.....	70	10,203,604	584¾	107	11,532,284	592¼
1900-1.....	99	14,057,664	689½	114	12,741,359	616

"While public bodies, at the end of that year (March, 1901), operated only 27 per cent. of the total tramways, they earned 43 per cent. of the aggregate net revenue and carried 46 per cent. of the total number of passengers conveyed. Since 1901 the greatest development in municipal tramways has taken place, while many of the companies figuring in the above returns have

been expropriated. Almost all the large cities not only own but operate their own tramways.

"One of the elements which helped forward the municipalization movement was the bad management of companies. They allowed their undertakings to become dilapidated toward the latter years of their leases. They were only concerned in making a general scramble to pay as much in dividends as possible. They paid their workmen so disgracefully that there were serious strikes in several cities, interrupting traffic. The cars were dirty, the horses bad, the service irregular, and in Glasgow, Liverpool, Leeds, and other cities there was general discontent at the incapacity of the tramway companies and the inefficiency of the service provided. In some towns the companies broke down altogether, and the municipalities took up the transportation problem and have successfully operated the trains.

"The average fare in Glasgow is less than two cents. The majority of the people travel short distances for one cent. The same is the case with the London County Council's municipal tramways.

"In London the average fare on the municipal cars is $1\frac{3}{4}$ cents. One-cent fares are introduced on the council's tramways, and 50,000,000 of workers are carried annually at this rate, thereby saving them over £100,000 a year. The employees are better treated; there is no friction, as has existed on the North Metropolitan system.

"The advantages of municipal ownership, even when it does not involve direct working of the tramways, are considerable. The municipality in leasing its lines at a yearly rental imposes terms, it regulates fares, provides for workingmen's cars and fair treatment for employees.

"The opponents of municipal ownership foreshadow that danger will arise from increasing the number of municipal employees, and that the tramway motormen and conductors will take part in elections, to serve their own ends. It is even suggested, as a remedy for this supposed danger, that all municipal employees should be disqualified from voting. On the other hand, it is pointed out that street railway companies in the past

have tried to use far greater influence upon public opinion than ever the employees are likely to do, and have used it solely with the hope of preserving their privileges. It is also shown that municipal employees are not likely to be so short-sighted as to advance unreasonable demands, knowing as they do that such conduct will only lead to reaction and the injury of their own class. As to their influence at election times, no indication of danger from it has yet arisen. It is possible for a representative of the tramway employees to be elected on a city council, but not solely by the vote of the employees. Trade-unionists have representatives at councils already, but so far they have only tended to increase the representative character of those assemblies.

"The municipalities are proving to be the pioneers in street railway enterprise. Huddersfield, for instance, led the way in using cars for post-office purposes. It placed collecting boxes on the cars and carried postmen and telegraph messengers, for which privileges the post-office paid an annual fee. The cars were also used for parcel delivery. Blackpool municipality gave the first example of the conduit system in England. Leeds experimented with the surface contact system of traction. Wolverhampton has laid down the Lorain system for a year's trial. Bournemouth is the only town now using the conduit system. Bradford contributed toward an experiment in electric traction to help the company get rid of its steam cars. Half-penny (one-cent) fares were popularized by Glasgow. Free transfers were initiated in Sheffield as soon as the system was municipalized. Until the London County Council acquired the tramways no night cars were run in London—no cars were on the streets after 12 o'clock, and they did not run early enough in the morning. The companies followed the example of the Council, but have now discontinued the system. Then the municipalities study the convenience of the population in all sorts of ways. They put on more workmen's cars for early morning service; Nottingham Council and others run special cars to football and cricket fields; Blackburn carries school children at farthing (half-cent) fares. The municipalities also

have led the way in providing their motormen and conductors with neat uniforms. They have treated their staff well, and the public has benefited by greater courtesy and politeness on the part of the men. Companies were in the habit of disfiguring the cars inside and out with advertisements; municipalities permit only very little advertising on cars, and in some cases—as in Glasgow—abolish it altogether. In every case municipalities have striven to provide the best possible services and to charge the lowest possible fares consistent with profit. They have sent deputations to European towns to investigate existing systems of traction, and each town has given the benefit of its experience to others. Unquestionably the British municipalities have in all directions shown more enterprise in street railway matters than companies have.

"The result of the municipalization of the gas and water undertakings has unquestionably been lower charges. The same is shown in the case of electric light. The average price charged, for instance, is more than 1d. per unit, or thousand watts, lower by municipalities than by companies. The benefits of the municipalization of the street railways—the latest development in municipal ownership—are now recognized. But public authorities have not done all their duty by showing that they can manage undertakings profitably and cheaply. Their chief aim should be to raise the standard of comfort, to improve the social and moral condition of the people they govern. Municipalities, for instance, must be model employers. They need not seek to surpass the best standard, but they should not fall below it.

"One of the dangers seen in municipal progress is said to be in the large increase of employees it involves. These employees, however, have various interests and are never likely to act as a unit. Their influence in local elections is not yet great, as they do not all live within the town in which they work. Should they become extravagant in their demands, or otherwise try to exploit the governing authority, there would be a reaction from which they would be the first to suffer.

"There are other aspects of a forward municipal policy.

There is the splendid stimulus which it gives to good citizenship. We see that in the rejoicings that take place in the opening of municipal street railways. The people feel that the cars are their cars, that it is the duty of the community to support their communal service. There is the feeling of corporate responsibility for the welfare of all classes. This spirit, which calls for self-sacrifice on the part of those who serve the public, leads to greater progress in the sanitary and intellectual needs of the people. *There is in every city, as the results of municipal work, a social and moral balance sheet which cannot be represented in figures, but the effect of which is enjoyed by all in the lives saved from disease, in a higher standard of living, and in an amelioration of the social conditions of the whole community."*

The Hon. Clinton Rogers Woodruff, speaking of the political influence of franchise corporations and the cause of the growing interest in municipal ownership, said: "The movement is primarily due to the popular indigraation felt at the corruption and degradation incident to the policy of private ownership. There is an ethical reaction against such practises, and it is manifesting itself in a demand for municipal ownership."

Nothing in the proceedings was more important than the discussion of direct legislation, showing that the referendum (or popular veto) and the initiative are essential to popular sovereignty of public ownership and operation of the government, which, as all three of the speakers declared, is the key to real and trustworthy public ownership of franchises.

It was a notable fact that those who spoke against municipal ownership were in every instance employees of some corporate interest, while those who spoke for it in most cases had no financial connection with it, and no motive for their advocacy but public spirit and conviction of the truth.

AFTERMATH OF THE VENEZUELAN AFFAIR.

IN THE ARENA for February we dealt with the case of the Allies *vs.* Venezuela from the standpoint of international law, and then expressed the hope that arbitration be substituted for force as a means of settling the dispute. That hope has been realized. And now that the smoke of battle has cleared away, it occurs to the writer that a short time may be profitably spent in considering the affair from the standpoint of international politics and trade.

That the matter has had a marked effect upon the prestige of certain nations does not admit of doubt. Nor is it less certain that the effect has been very different in the case of different nations. While the prestige of a nation is not susceptible to exact measurement, it can nevertheless be rather closely estimated; and it is usually not difficult to discover an increase or decrease. Not infrequently even a slight variation is noticeable. The bases of prestige are chiefly these: wealth, as shown by the condition of a country's industries, commerce, and credit; the general intelligence and moral worth of its people and the skill of its statesmen; military strength, either present or potential. The barometers by which prestige is measured are: the opinion of the "man in the street," the press, and government officials. The readings upon each of these may differ considerably, but in this case a sort of general average is struck.

Bearing these facts in mind, let us notice the effect of the Venezuelan affair upon the prestige of the United States, first among the Latin-American countries and second among the countries of Europe. It must be confessed that previous to the present dispute, which has done a great deal toward clarifying in the minds of Latin-Americans our real attitude toward them, there was among them a rather general lack of appreciation of our importance as a factor in international politics, and especially as a protector of their welfare. Our evi-

dent mastery of the situation in the present emergency has gone a long way toward convincing them of their error in both respects. The very great service we have rendered them in bringing to an end the hostilities between the allies and Venezuela, in providing for a just and equitable settlement of the claims, and thus establishing a precedent that will discourage a resort to force in the future, has been a most practical demonstration of our friendship and of its value to them. And as it has given us an opportunity again to put ourselves upon record as favoring the submission to arbitration of disputes to which they or any of them are a party, it has served further to impress upon their minds a fact that they have been slow to accept; *viz.*, that we do not favor a resort to force as a means of adjusting disputes with our southern sisters, notwithstanding the advantage such a method would give us in case of a dispute between them and us. In the nature of things the weaker States, in which category are all the Latin-American republics, must be grateful to us for championing the cause of international arbitration as against brute force.

Not only has the general fact of our advocacy of the cause of international arbitration in the present instance endeared us to our southern sisters and increased our prestige among them, but several incidents have tended in the same direction. The fact that during the gallant and fearless naval exploits of the allied fleets we had a powerful squadron at Culebra did not escape the notice of those countries which felt their helplessness in the face of foreign aggression. Whether or not their conclusion was correct we do not say, but the fact is that they believed that the proximity of our fleet had a steadying influence upon the somewhat exuberant gesticulations of the "mailed fist." The effect that such a belief must exert upon our prestige among them is too evident to require comment. The choice of Minister Bowen to represent Venezuela is a striking evidence of our prestige, which his firmness in the negotiations has served still further to increase. The promptness with which our Secretary of State agreed to a protocol and the liberality of its terms are placed in contrast with the action of

the allies and have produced in the South American mind the natural result. Our courtesy in tendering the Venezuelan government the use of our warships to bring the officers of the Venezuelan navy from Trinidad to La Guayra contrasts very favorably with the lack of courtesy on the part of the allies in failing to return the Venezuelan ships and officers to their port.

The effect that all this will have upon our South American trade cannot, of course, be predicted with accuracy; yet we are entirely safe in predicting that it will have some effect, and especially in Venezuela. For while friendship is not the foundation upon which trade rests, it is nevertheless a factor in determining trade relations, whether between individuals or between nations.

Thus far our trade with Latin-American countries has been severely handicapped by reason of a lack of direct communication between their ports and ours. Yet this handicap will not continue forever. With the increase in our merchant marine, due to our relatively cheap and abundant supply of coal and iron, it is not at all extravagant to predict that we will soon have direct steamship communication between the eastern ports of South America and our Atlantic and Gulf ports. Furthermore, the completion of the Panama Canal will bring our manufacturing centers several hundred miles nearer to the western ports of South America than are, or rather will be, those of Europe. Until very recent years our lack of communication with Mexico placed us at a disadvantage with Europe in our competition for the Mexican trade, notwithstanding our geographical nearness. A change in transportation facilities has brought about a change in our share of the Mexican trade, over half of which is now with us, and our share in it is rapidly increasing, both absolutely and relatively. As we can now produce the articles desired by the countries lying to the south of us at as low a cost as they can be produced by any other country in the world, and have ample ground for believing that we will in the near future have equally good and cheap transportation facilities, the question of friendship becomes an important and deciding one.

At present the country that is most rapidly increasing its trade in South America is Germany. But with the changed feeling brought about let us suppose that two articles of the same quality are offered in a South American market at the same price, the one bearing the trade-mark, "made in Germany," the other bearing as its trade-mark, "made in the United States": it does not require a master of occult science or telepathy, a soothsayer or a philosopher, to determine which make of goods will be in the greater demand. If in addition to this our Senate should permit reciprocity to become something more than a name in our political code, the fact of our increased friendliness with our neighbors to the south of us would have an added and very practical significance from the standpoint of international trade. For in the negotiation and ratification of a treaty it cannot be denied that national likes and dislikes, *i.e.*, national prejudices, are an important factor.

Turning from South America to Europe and from trade back to prestige, we find that the settlement of the "Venezuelan mess" is considered as a diplomatic triumph for the United States, and has increased our prestige accordingly. This is especially true as regards England, though hardly less true as regards France and Russia. In many quarters this demonstration of our mastery of the situation is regarded as sufficient to put an end to any similar aggressions by European powers in South or Central America. The very substantial assistance that our action has rendered the cause of peace by increasing as it has the importance of The Hague tribunal as a court for settling international disputes has, of course, challenged the admiration of the smaller States of Europe. It is gratifying to note that the charge of bullying or bluffing cannot be successfully urged in order to mar the completeness of our diplomatic triumph. The conduct of the Department of State was characterized by courtesy and wisdom at every stage in the negotiations.

So much for its effect upon American prestige. How different its effect upon the prestige of the "Allies!" The latter cannot be said to have secured any glory at all out of the pro-

ceedings. Even their demonstration that their combined fleet was superior to that of Venezuela did not fill the minds of other nations with either awe or admiration any more than it filled the coffers of the allies with coin.

As regards England, her loss of prestige, which is now frankly admitted by Englishmen, is due to a twofold reason: (1) that she should have played the rôle of bumbailiff for bondholders at all on this occasion, and (2) that she should have allied herself with Germany, or, to put it in the words of Kipling, "to league anew with the Goth and the shameless Hun," thus becoming to a considerable extent a cat's-paw and being forced to countenance methods in which she could take no just pride—and, what was perhaps equally distasteful to her, to risk a straining of her friendship with the United States. In describing this "triumph of inefficiency," Henry Norman, a member of the House of Commons and editor of the *World's Work*, says: "On all sides and by people of all opinions it is condemned as a gratuitous and inexplicable blunder." The *London Times*, which is a very conservative journal, contains the following: "It is perhaps less clear to the public at home than it is to Englishmen residing abroad to what extent this latest move in England's foreign policy has affected British prestige. It cannot be denied, however, that, since foreigners have come to look upon England as more or less the dupe of Germany in the Venezuelan affair, our foreign policy, at all events, has been the object of general censure abroad."

The conduct of Germany has unquestionably added nothing to her prestige, either in Europe or elsewhere. The methods of the bully are not well calculated to reflect credit upon any nation. Italy has played the rôle of the small boy who tries to appear large by imitating a large companion, and has of course added nothing to her prestige thereby. The prestige of a nation, like that of an individual, cannot be increased by aping others.

The future South American trade of the allies will undoubtedly suffer to some extent from the high-handed methods to which they have resorted in the present instance, which South

Americans feel might have been still further persisted in had not developments in the Near East diverted the attention of the allies. This loss will, we are convinced, be particularly noticeable with reference to the Venezuelan trade, which fortunately we are in a position to handle, as we have in the Red D Line direct steamship communication with the Venezuelan ports, and already have a large share of their trade—larger than that of any two European countries and larger than we have with any other South American States. We again call attention to this fact, as it illustrates two things: (1) the importance of having our own steamship communications as a factor in securing trade, and (2) the effect of our friendliness to Venezuela in her dispute with England of eight years ago.

It is but natural that Americans should take a pardonable pride in the part that we have played in the drama; nor can they fail to admire the wisdom shown by President Roosevelt in courteously refusing to be inveigled by flattery into accepting the responsibility for rendering a decision that would necessarily subject him to adverse criticism by the one side or the other, or by both, and hence would result in a sacrifice of a part at least of the advantage we have gained.

It is indeed gratifying to note that this triumph has come at a very opportune time, and that it has cost us nothing. The "other fellows" have footed the bill. It rarely happens that so great a victory can be achieved without some sacrifice of blood or treasure, self-respect, or the respect of others.

EDWIN MAXEY.

Columbian University.

THE PROBLEM OF THE BLACKS.

THE following are actual happenings: A year ago this month of March, while driving with a typical Florida "Cracker" through his open pine woods, in balmy air and amid the odors of orange blossoms, I was informed by my companion that "a nigger's a nigger all the way through." This driver was one of Nature's noblemen, and although he had never been out of his State he was gentle, reasonable, brave, and an honest man. He had a large family, whom he had trained to be dutiful, obedient, respectable, and industrious. He doted upon his children, and always said a pious and feeling "grace" at the table. He was a hearty and jolly host, and an American to the tips of his fingers; he was deputy-sheriff of the county and a good citizen. In this poor, illiterate, backwoods planter I became acquainted with a type of our countrymen that called for respect, confidence, and love—and I told him so. After a week of intimacy I found him to have a natural flavor of fairness, tolerance, and generosity that inclined me to leave local questions to his class with entire confidence.

Per contra: My respected relative in northern New York, with whom I had enjoyed a friendship of sixty years, and by whose side I had fought for the Union all through the Civil War, represents the geographical antithesis of these Southerners upon this negro question. His is the abstract, the other's the concrete. The Northerner had lived upon a farm all his life, had scarcely ever seen a negro, certainly had never employed or lived with one, and had always since he was knee-high sworn by Horace Greeley. He denounced me as a family degenerate because I acknowledged that the same uncivil words were more vexing when spoken by a negro than when spoken by a white man. I replied: "Bill, wait until you get your first unprovoked and unnecessary insolence from a nigger; then you will find something new rising up within you—a

strange, bad blood." To this was the indignant answer: "What! You—from an old Free Soil family and a Republican all your life—spell *negro* with two g's, like a Democrat?" We have never been the same to each other since. I do not quote "nigger" as against all negroes; my relations to them, both North and South, have always been agreeable and mutually trusting, which has not always been the case with white employees.

The above incidents are an epitome of our respective sectional attitudes upon the negro problem. It is not my present intention to catalogue the crimes and nuisances with which the Northman's ears are assailed by the Southman, although I will continue the remarks of my "Cracker" friend. He said: "I'd just as soon shoot a nigger as shoot a snake, and yet I manage them very well and hire them right along. Freedom has spiled 'em, though it has liberated us. I tell you, Cap'n, a bad nigger's like a bad egg or a bad oyster—very bad. You ketch a disease from a nigger an' it goes hard with you; the doctors kin tell you thet." When I denounced lynching and burning at the stake as disgracing the whole country in the eyes of the world, he replied that he did not believe in cruelty, but *did* approve of lynching, saying that was the only means to a desirable end and that the lynchers were surer in their law than the authorities. He continued: "Why, I hild a lynching spree once and the nigger sot right thar on this seat, whar you're settin', and I sot right here, and that's the same pony that druv him under a limb whar we left him hangin'. He had abducted a young white girl out into the woods and tied her up thar three days. What d'ye think I'd do if hit was my 'Melia thar at the house? I tell you, Cap., ye don't know anything about it." Just then a negro passed, raised his cap to the sheriff, and there was a friendly greeting. My companion added: "See that? Oh, they know me; I'm squar with them. They know when I come out with my Winchester they hev ter come. But I allus treat 'em right, and they know they can depend on my word."

In all governments, especially confederacies, local views are

important factors in the decision of national questions. It is neither good sense nor good law for a geographical majority to override a geographical minority on questions affecting the latter almost solely. The habit of doing so springs from innate tyranny and intolerance. While the laws, like negro suffrage and office administering, must be sustained, they are not cast iron, and they must be administered with some practical regard for flexible human nature and provincial breeding. First, we Americans have the inborn social sentiment of master and slave. No Northern employer will take insolence from a white servant. Then there is the natural antipathy of color when not momentarily overcome by dog appetite. We cannot demonstrate that all men are brothers; they may be only cousins. If, first off, "God made man out of the dust of the earth and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life," there was plenty of dust, and the breath of life filled the Universe with which to start a different beginning of species on every continent and island of the sea. Spontaneous generation could as easily have occurred many times as in the one allegorical Adam. This ethnic prejudice is as universal and deep as the foundations of the earth. Nowhere in the world is it deeper than in our Pharisaical North—in all our society. We must be patient and tolerant on both sides, confronting our situation as reasoning, Christian men, or there shall come unutterable woe. We all shall have our griefs soon enough without political follies. Even our old Abolition families who have retired from business and gone to Washington to settle have become the most bitter negro haters, while the Southerners there are practically tolerant; indeed, their composure under the trying circumstances of the aggressive thievery, indolence, and insolence of the blacks is most admirable.

What is the remedy? Race hatred is like a silent magazine—ready for a touch and havoc. I would rather to-day domicile permanently over a powder-house than in the South. There is no more sacred obligation that this nation owes than to begin immediately with all its wisdom and wealth to set these race relations right, because our sudden emancipation of the slaves

by the act of war, without any adequate provision for the new relation of both races, upsetting in a day the social laws and economics of all past time, necessarily entails confusing incidents and requires time, patience, and wisdom to compose society. The following is suggested:

Segregation.—Remove, by agrarianism, the blacks from personal contact with the whites, by their voluntary consent, down to a political minority. This can be done without any individual hardship or inconvenience. Then all other questions relating to the races will naturally take care of themselves. The blacks are naturally adapted to the soil, and we have plenty of that in our own country. But the *Cubans* stand ready to sell to them a million farms for spot cash. In Cuba our blacks would readily assimilate, find themselves a political factor, no color line, a suitable climate, near home, would take thither the Stars and Stripes, help spread the English language, and vote for annexation every time. They would have no small share in helping to Americanize Cuba. It is for them truly the Promised Land. The new truck farming, the undeveloped mechanical arts, and the coming need of Americans there for American servants—all invite them. There need be no "colonization," nor enforced expatriation, but just individual emigration—dispersion and selection as all white peoples do to better their condition, many now going to Cuba.

Our fee-simple in the island by both conquest and treaty almost seems providential in helping the solution of the American negro problem. We have let slip some of our opportunity in not applying this theory to our Western lands before they were settled. We may profit by that mistake in Cuba. There would be no objection there to a million black incomers backed with Northern money. Moreover, our great West is still inviting the labor, the patience, and the loyalty of the negroes, by individual location as well as by townships and countyships. Let a national bureau be formed for the purpose of buying and distributing small and equipped farms for free distribution to all blacks of the cotton States where their numerical superiority is dreaded. It could be done more

easily and cheaply than transporting an army of invasion and occupation. These people could be located and supervised during a few years of probation, after which the farm could be presented to them as a gift for good behavior.

It is said that one hour's work a day in Cuba will support an individual, and that not over one-tenth of the land is under cultivation. The population is now a little over a million and a half, although the island can support ten millions. So what a wonderful field of development is there presented!

This is an old-fashioned cure-all for social ills, like bone-set for physical ills. Both simple home remedies have been too long disused. While there is now opportunity for the individual diffusion of these beneficiaries among the normal population of our own country, where they would receive the benefits of contact and example, there could be town and county organizations where they would enjoy political enfranchisement equally under the laws—also representation, where the whites never would object, on account of their being a minority. In fact, their force would be sought after by politicians and the spoils divided. If General Leonard Wood, while having summary military authority in Cuba, had started this plant there, it would have been found tenacious and thrifty. There is time yet. Any Congressman should deem it the most useful and honorable act of his life to vote a hundred millions of Federal cash to buy and equip small farms and transport to Cuba all the surplus and threatening blacks of the South.

WILLIAM HEMSTREET.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

JEFFERSON'S SERVICE TO CIVILIZATION DURING THE FOUNDING OF THE REPUBLIC.

I. HIS PLACE AMONG CONSTRUCTIVE STATESMEN.

AT the present time, when we are preparing to celebrate the centennial anniversary of the peaceable acquisition of the Louisiana territory, the splendid service to the nation rendered by Thomas Jefferson as President of the Republic is rightly commanding the attention of thoughtful patriots; for the peaceable acquisition of this vast domain was rendered possible largely through his foresight and broad-visioned statesmanship. He did not create the opportunity, but he so prepared for the contingency that when the opportunity arose the representatives of the Republic were on the spot to act with the courage and despatch necessary. And this service to the United States was but one of many noble achievements that marked his eight years as Chief Executive. Yet, important as was his work in the Presidential chair, it is overshadowed by his inestimable service to civilization prior to and during the establishing of the Republic.

Thomas Jefferson possessed in a larger degree than any other leading constructive statesman in active political life during the foundation period of our Republic the ideals and aspirations of the noblest thinkers and most devoted friends of free government of the present time. He more than any other President of the last century stood for the four cardinal and essential demands of a civilization dominated by the genius of justice, progress, and felicity: (1) equal rights for all and special privileges for none; (2) liberty of conscience, freedom of speech, and a free press; (3) peace and amity between men and nations; (4) universal education. Moreover, he more than any leading New World statesman of a hundred years ago embodied the noblest concept of the spirit of Democracy that up to his day had appeared above the horizon of civilization.

II. PREPARATION FOR HIS WORK.

Thomas Jefferson was born in Albemarle County, Virginia, April 2, 1743. From his fifth year until he was sixteen he enjoyed the instruction of the ablest tutors in the vicinity of his home. When sixteen years of age he entered William and Mary College, at Williamsburg, and two years later was graduated from that institution. Though only eighteen years of age, he was remarkably proficient in Greek, Latin, and French, in higher mathematics, natural science, and history, and was thoroughly conversant with the masterpieces of literature, ancient and modern.

Determining on law as a profession, he entered the office of George Wythe, one of the ablest and most high-minded attorneys and jurists of the time. It is an interesting fact that this profound legal scholar prepared three young men for the bar who were destined to rank among the most illustrious public servants of the Republic—Thomas Jefferson, Chief Justice Marshall, and Henry Clay.

In the early days it was no difficult task to obtain admittance to the Virginia bar. Patrick Henry, with no special previous training, passed muster after only six weeks' study. But Jefferson was born with the instincts of a true scholar. No superficial knowledge or half-way recognition of facts satisfied him. He must sound the depths and seek the fountain-head for a thorough knowledge of the origin of statutes.

For five years Jefferson studied law—studied it exhaustively, after the manner of a scientific student who is not content until he has traced laws to their origin and has become conversant with the conditions obtaining when great rulings were made or precedents established.

III. HIS SERVICE TO FREEDOM BEFORE THE REVOLUTION OPENED.

In 1768 Jefferson was elected to represent Albemarle County in the Virginia House of Burgesses, a position to which he was

chosen at every successive election until the House was closed by the Revolution. His legislative experience during the first session was very brief; for three days after the formal opening of the House the members of the legislature, in response to an appeal from Massachusetts to resist by all constitutional means the attempt of England to collect duties on certain articles of import, passed resolutions declaring against taxation without representation, affirming the right of the colonies to confer and coöperate in efforts to redress their grievances, and denouncing as "an inexpressible complexity of wrong" the act providing that accused persons should be sent from their country for trial.

For the passing of this outspoken act the royal governor dissolved the House, whereupon the legislators repaired to the historic Raleigh Tavern, at Williamsburg, and resolved to buy no more English goods that could possibly be dispensed with, and to urge their countrymen to do the same. Among the eighty-eight members who signed this compact were Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, Patrick Henry, George Mason, and R. H. Lee.

Rapidly and darkly grew the clouds that threatened war. The excitement over the investigation being conducted by the authorities for the Crown over the burning of the "Gaspee" in the waters of Rhode Island had reached fever heat in March, 1773, when a company of as rare souls as ever risked life in defense of a principal assembled in Raleigh Tavern. All were members of the House of Burgesses; all were young men; and Thomas Jefferson was there, as he was from the first a leading spirit in the Revolutionary meetings. These daring young statesmen framed a resolution with great care, so as not to alarm the timid members, but which was destined to bear momentous results. It provided for the appointment of a Committee of Correspondence and Inquiry for the dissemination of intelligence between the colonies. It was to be a standing committee of eleven. To prevent miscarriage and allay apprehension the resolution was offered—"For the purpose of quieting the minds of His Majesty's faithful servants in this colony, which had

been much disturbed by various rumors and reports of proceedings tending to deprive them of their ancient legal and constitutional rights."

Other colonies were urged to appoint similar committees. The resolution was promptly passed, and the committee appointed contained such earnest young patriots as Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, Peyton Randolph, and Richard Henry Lee.

This bold action was followed by the dissolution of the House, but the committee remained at the capital and carefully prepared a circular letter, addressed to all the colonies, in which the purpose of the committee was fully explained and an urgent invitation was put forth to each colony immediately to appoint a similar committee, to the end that the thirteen dependencies might be kept in close touch and promptly informed of every overt act taken.

Not only did the colonies promptly respond, but ere long almost every county, settlement, and village had its committee. Their work was indispensable. At one time they were the soul and strength of the rising tide of opposition, the hope of liberty, and the bond of union that emboldened men and colonies to speak and strike in a way that would not have been thought of if there had been no sense of strength through organization and concert of counsel.

If to-day in every State the friends of Majority Rule and the foes of the criminal aggressions of corporate greed had these State and county standing Correspondence Committees of Eleven, like the old colonial patriots, and composed of the brightest and bravest men among the conscience element, the corruption of political life incident to virtual government by the corporations and the exploitation and robbery of the people through privilege and monopoly could be quickly checked. Here as on numerous other occasions the actions of Jefferson and the young patriots of the seventies indicate a wise course for the apostles of progressive democracy and justice to-day.

In the spring of 1774 the House of Burgesses assembled, with Jefferson and many of his patriotic friends in their accustomed

seats. The Boston Port bill had been published. For the throwing overboard of some chests of tea by some citizens, the first city of New England was to be destroyed by the closing of her ports on June 1st. Young Virginia was as much alive to the gravity of the situation as were the patriots of Massachusetts. All were brothers now, and again in the famous old Raleigh Tavern we find Jefferson, Patrick Henry, the two Lees, and a few other leading spirits of revolt closeted. They are again mapping out an important line of action. All feel that the object of the most pressing importance is the immediate rousing of the whole population of Virginia to the peril that confronts the American dependencies.

It was finally decided to attempt to pass an order through the House of Burgesses setting apart June 1st as a day for fasting, prayer, and humiliation, to be observed in all the churches. It required tact and skill to prepare a resolution that could be passed, as the nearer the hour drew for the cloud-burst the more timid became the older and more conservative members. In after years, when referring to this important meeting, Jefferson wrote: "We cooked up a resolution, somewhat modernizing the Puritan phrases, appointing the first day of June for a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer, to implore Heaven to avert from us the evils of civil war and to inspire us with firmness in support of our Rights, and to turn the hearts of the King and Parliament to moderation and justice."

The young men who prepared this resolution were famed more for skill with the violin and grace in dancing than for piety and prayer; and Jefferson well understood that if he or any of his youthful confrères were to offer the resolution, with their pious preamble smelling so strongly of the "godly" days when Oliver Cromwell and his Ironsides ever had a prayer on their lips, a psalm in their throats, or a sacred text on their tongues, it would, or at least might, call forth the ridicule of the opposition and in the end defeat the measure. So a pious elderly member was sought out, and he agreed to offer the resolution, which was promptly passed.

Again the royal governor dissolved the House. The mem-

bers met the next day at the Raleigh Tavern, where they directed the Committee of Correspondence to propose an American Congress of Deputies for all the colonies. Next they voted to meet in August to elect the Virginia members to the proposed congress, and they boldly declared that an attack on one colony was an attack on all.

With this action Virginia may be said to have passed the Rubicon.

Immediately after the adjournment of the meeting the members set out to their various bailiwicks, where they enthused the clergymen of the colony with their own patriotism and so aroused the people that by the first of June the great fast day led to the crystallizing of the revolutionary sentiment of the colony, just as the leaders had predicted it would. Never before, and rarely since, have the clergy been so brave and outspoken. "The cause of liberty is the cause of God!" exclaimed one minister; and this was the sentiment echoed from ocean to mountain. In after years Jefferson wrote of this memorable occasion: "The effect of the day was like a shock of electricity, arousing every man and placing him erect and solidly on his center."

Between the dissolution of the House of Burgesses and the meeting of the members to appoint delegates to the proposed American Congress, Jefferson had been busily engaged in a somewhat exhaustive and remarkably bold and brilliant presentation of the cause of the colonies, embodied as an outline for a series of instructions to be given to the Virginia delegates for their introduction at the general congress. Unfortunately, when he was *en route* for Williamsburg he was taken suddenly ill and was thus prevented from attending the meeting. Copies of this brief of his for the colonies were, however, forwarded by him to the president of the House, and by him laid before the members. The legislature regarded the argument as rather too radical for the time, though it exerted great influence on those who read the manuscript; and the members ordered that it be published in pamphlet form and circulated for the good of the cause under the title of "A Summary View of the Rights

of America." In it the fearless young statesman boldly contended—

"That the relation between Great Britain and these colonies was exactly the same as that of England and Scotland after the accession of James and before the Union, and the same as her present relation with Hanover, having the same executive chief but no other necessary political connection; and that our emigration to this country gave no more right over us than the emigration of Danes and Saxons gave to the present authorities of the Mother Country over England."

The publication of this pamphlet produced a tremendous impression wherever it was read. It was eagerly sought for on every hand and ran through several editions. There can be no doubt that, coming at the time it did, it exerted a very positive and far-reaching influence in favor of a bold and firm stand against English aggression.

Copies soon found their way into England. The Liberals hailed it with delight. Some one, it is said to have been Burke, after making some interpolations, republished it to aid the cause of the Opposition. There also several editions were exhausted. "This paper," observes the Honorable John Bigelow, "placed Jefferson among the leaders if not at the head of the revolutionary movement in America. The Declaration of Independence, two years later, was but a perfected transcript of the 'Summary View.'"

From the date of the publishing of this pamphlet Jefferson was the master spirit in the Virginia convention and was as a matter of course selected as a representative from Virginia to the general congress that had been called to meet in Philadelphia.

IV. WRITING THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

Shortly after arriving in Philadelphia, Jefferson was assigned committee work when important memorials and replies were to be prepared. His superior education, his knowledge of law, of the precedents of history and of problems relating to political progress, and his happy faculty for presenting a cause

in a strong and convincing manner, rendered his services invaluable.

After the Battle of Lexington even the most timid of the representatives came to share the opinions of Mr. Jefferson embodied in his "Summary View." Then it was seen that he had not only clearly perceived the coming storm, but he had voiced with marvelous clearness and felicity the opinions and position of America. Consequently, when the memorable committee was appointed to draft the Declaration of Independence, consisting of Franklin, Adams, Sherman, Livingstone, and Jefferson, the latter was selected to draw up the momentous paper. This he promptly did, and after some slight and inconsequential modifications it was adopted by the House and signed on July 4th, 1776.

In speaking of the historical importance that circumstances have given to this great document, Mr. Bigelow observes that—

"It seemed to be the weapon that dismembered a great empire and that gave birth to a nation of unbounded possibilities. It gave guaranties for the fame of its author which are possessed by no other production of an American pen. For more than a century it has been read to assembled multitudes in every considerable town in the United States on the anniversary of its adoption; and its style and sentiments have been the model for every people which since that time has sought to assert for itself the right of self-government."

For two months after the signing of the Declaration of Independence Jefferson labored incessantly further to aid in the organization of the government and in the preparation for the struggle being waged. At length he felt he could be better spared to the cause of freedom from the general congress than from the legislature in his own State, where matters of great moment were to be met. Accordingly, he resigned his seat in congress and repaired to Virginia.

V. PROFOUND STATESMANSHIP EVINCED AS A LAWMAKER.

This step was taken because he was profoundly impressed with the importance of Virginia aiding in setting the pace for

civilization in the New World in regard to just laws that should supplant the old, cumbersome, and unjust statutes that had prevailed. He wished to wipe out many relics of barbarism, and he knew he possessed much influence that might at that time prove of genuine service to civilization.

"When I left Congress in 1776," he tells us in his Autobiography, "it was in the persuasion that our whole code must be reviewed and adapted to our republican form of government, and, now that we had no negatives of councils, governors, and kings to restrain us from doing right, that it be corrected in all its parts with a single eye to reason and the good of those for whose government it was framed."

Arriving at the seat of government, he was at once recognized as the leader and the very life of the progressive or reform element; while around him ranged four or five of as noble-minded men as Virginia has given the world. But in the great reform battle in the legislature, as well as as the leader of the committee for the revision of all laws of Virginia, Jefferson was from first to last the master spirit. This is not saying that nearly all the splendid reforms he sought to compass were enacted at this time, or even during the ten or twelve succeeding years, when the magnificent work outlined by Jefferson so far as possible was pushed forward by his most able disciple, James Madison. That could not be expected when a statesman fully one hundred years in advance of his age labored with men who were the products of generations of monarchic rule and whose whole lives had been passed under ancient and oftentimes cruel and barbarously unjust laws.

But the work he accomplished and the measures outlined by him and enacted within the next few years would alone entitle him to a high place among the great benefactors of the New World, though his bold championship of the cause of justice raised a storm of opposition from conservatives and upholders of the old order that continued in a measure for more than thirty years.

"Never, perhaps," observes Mr. Parton, "since the earliest historic times has one mind so incorporated itself with a coun-

try's laws and institutions as Jefferson with those of new-born Virginia."

His first victory was won in a hard-fought battle for the abolition of the laws of entail. Many of the great old Virginia houses regarded with dismay the success of this bold innovator in sweeping from the statutes this time-honored and deeply cherished *injustice*.

Next came a still more severe contest—the battle against a State Church and for freedom of thought in religious matters. The Established Church of England had long been supported by the people, and now this powerful church organization, almost its whole clergy, and the majority of its wealthiest members were arrayed against Jefferson and his intrepid band. Yet the spirit of the hour and the masterly arguments of the broad-minded reformer overturned entrenched injustice, bulwarked though it were by prejudice, precedent, and conventionalism. At first the victory was but partial, but the arguments marshaled by Jefferson and the fearless pushing forward of the work by Madison and others of his enthusiastic disciples soon accomplished the great reform.

Another hoary but cherished injustice was swept away after a stubborn contest in the abolition of primogeniture and in the enactment of a law requiring equal partition of inheritances. Here again conventionalism and conservatism made a desperate but unavailing stand.

Another bill successfully defended by Jefferson at this time forbade the further introduction of slaves into the State of Virginia. This was all that it was then found possible to accomplish against slavery, on account of the moral blindness that, save in rare and luminous instances, has ever made men, nations, and civilizations grope instead of walk toward the light, because they refuse to behold and follow the divine light of justice, duty, and love, when self-desire, sordid gain, or material advancement promise to be furthered by such refusal.

He is blind indeed who, to-day, surveying the past in the perspective of over a hundred years, fails to appreciate the essential wisdom and far-sighted statesmanship as well as the

noble humanitarian spirit that characterized the carefully wrought schemes of Jefferson made at this time for the gradual emancipation and civilization of the slaves. George Wythe, who was an outspoken advocate of abolition, heartily agreed with Jefferson, and Mr. Pendleton also assented to the fundamental demand—that of “freedom for all born after a certain date and deportation at a proper age.” But all agreed that it would be wise to fight for the abolition of slavery, when the motion concerning the slave laws came up, by introducing at that time Mr. Jefferson’s amendments. Such was the opposition manifested, however, that it became evident that the proposed amendments had no possibility of receiving a fair hearing, and they were not pressed.

The provisions of the proposed legislation, which this statesman, who was destined to be the first Democratic President, desired to see enacted, were briefly as follows:

(1) The emancipation of all slaves born after the passage of the act. (2) The children to continue with their parents to a certain age, then to be brought up at the public expense “to tillage, arts, or sciences, according to their genius,” until the females should be eighteen and the males twenty-one years of age. (3) They should then “be colonized to such places as the circumstances of the time should render most proper, sending them out with arms, implements of household and of handicraft arts, seeds, pairs of domestic animals, etc.” (4) “To declare them a free and independent people and extend to them our assistance and protection until they have acquired strength.” (5) “To send vessels at the same time to other parts of the world for an equal number of white inhabitants and to urge them to emigrate here by making them proper inducements.”

Thus he would have had the State gradually abolish slavery, substituting white free labor in the place of what he saw would ere long become a supreme peril.

It has been the custom of progressive writers, even the biographers of Mr. Jefferson, timidly to apologize for this proposition as something that indicated the lack of practicality in the statesman; while his enemies, the gold-worshipping, idealless,

opportunist contingent, have ever ridiculed it as something at once reprehensible and absurd. Yet the fact remained that Jefferson was right and all his apologists and critics were wrong, as in the long run the man is always vindicated who takes his stand on fundamental justice. If history teaches any one truth more clearly than another, it is that only the disciples of the *ideal* live in the love of the ages and are an inspiration to upward-striving life. Ignoring for the moment the supreme reason why Jefferson was right,—that of his position being just and in alignment with the demands of the Golden Rule,—and considering the question merely from the viewpoint of expediency, it will be found that of all statesmen of the age and time he was on this question the most preëminently practical. The Civil War, with its frightful waste of human life; its measureless ocean of suffering and despair; the enormous public debt it entailed; the transformation of opulent States into desert-like wastes; the frightful aftermath of the reconstruction period; the hate engendered; and last, but by no means least, the moral degradation that crept into public life when the thoughts and energies of all the noblest statesmen were centered on the maintenance of the Union—moral degradation and corruption that laid the foundation for the reign of special privilege and the rise of plutocracy: these are some of the frightful costs that came as a result of the people turning a deaf ear to the far-seeing statesmanship of Thomas Jefferson. The sum that he would have had the States spend for the abolition of slavery would all told have been a mere pittance compared with even the monetary cost to the North and South of the great civil struggle that he foresaw and sought to avert; while the triumph of Jefferson's program would have placed the American people still higher in the scale of moral worth.

No question or cause can be settled until it squares with the Higher Law. The demands of justice, of human rights, and of freedom may be ignored and pushed aside for years, generations, and even centuries, but every infraction of the moral law sooner or later brings its terrible retribution—the reaping of the tares. In after years Jefferson wrote: "Nothing is more

certainly written in the Book of Fate than that these people are to be free. . . . It is still in our power to direct the processes of emancipation and deportation peaceably and in such slow degree as that the evil will wear off insensibly and their place be *pari passu* filled up with free white laborers. If, on the contrary, it is left to force itself on, human nature must shudder at the prospects held up." No truer warning was ever uttered, no prophecy more terribly fulfilled.

If his clear seeing in regard to slavery proved him a prophetic statesman, above and in advance of his age, his noble plan for popular education showed that he more than any other philosophic statesman of his time understood the basic fact that free government can only live in the presence of an enlightened people. His elaborate and carefully wrought out plan for popular education was worthy of a great thinker whose appreciation of the importance of enlightenment was only second to his passion for justice.

He proposed that common schools should be established in the counties of the State, one school to every one hundred householders. They were to be supported by the State. Every ten schools were to have a director or overseer. The State was also to be divided into twenty grammar-school districts, in each of which a grammar-school building, with suitable accommodations for bed and board, was to be erected on public land. These, like the common schools, were to be supported by the public, and here English grammar, Greek, Latin, higher mathematics, and other studies were to be taught. Those scholars who industriously pursued their studies and successfully passed their examinations were to be permitted to attend for several years, while those failing to reach a certain percentage were to be dropped out at the end of each year. Each year also one especially competent pupil was to be selected from each grammar school, thus making twenty in all from the State, and sent to William and Mary College, where they were to be given their tuition, board, lodging, and clothing during the three years required for the full course in that institution.

Jefferson knew that the wealth of the colony was at that time

insufficient to enable it to board, clothe, and school all the children, but by his proposed plan every child would have the opportunity to obtain a common-school education, and many a grammar-school training; while each year the State would be enriched by twenty youths whose previous education had indicated that they were intellectually the flower of the youth of the State, equipped with the best college education the community afforded. It will be observed also that this plan would have established the precedent of the State assuming as her proper function, not merely the intellectual education of the children, but the supplying, so far as her resources would permit, of food, clothing, and shelter for the young while they were acquiring the knowledge he felt to be absolutely essential to the permanent triumph of true democracy. This may have been socialistic in spirit and tendency, but it certainly was wise and evinced far-seeing statesmanship.

The plan of education as outlined by Mr. Jefferson included the founding of a State public library and the establishing of William and Mary College as a State university. He had the drafting of the entire educational plan, but in this work George Wythe and Edward Pendleton concurred.

VI. MINISTER TO FRANCE.

In 1779 Jefferson was elected Governor of Virginia. The infant State thus far had for the most part escaped the ravages of war and had lavishly sent men and means to strengthen and aid General Washington; and later, after Jefferson became Governor, when the more southern colonies were attacked, she sent men and munitions to aid in the Carolinas, and when, drained of men and resources, the enemy descended upon her defenseless shores, Richmond was captured and ravished by Arnold. The legislature adjourned to Charlottesville, but being pursued they disbanded. Jefferson narrowly escaped capture.

The lack of aggressive defense on the part of Governor Jefferson was seized upon by his enemies all over the State, whose animosity had been aroused by his great reform acts, as some-

thing reprehensible. But here, as at other times, Jefferson's actions were prompted by the highest motives of patriotism. The success of Washington and of the whole nation was of far more importance than the making of a doubtful stand against the British in Virginia; and, when it was found that Jefferson had merely acted in harmony with Washington's desires, the next legislature passed a strong resolution of confidence and approved his services as Governor.

In 1784 Mr. Jefferson was appointed by Congress minister plenipotentiary to act with Benjamin Franklin and John Adams in negotiating treaties with European nations, and in 1785 he was appointed Minister to France, to succeed Dr. Franklin, a position he held until 1789, discharging his duties in an eminently satisfactory manner. He succeeded in securing important modifications of the French tariff in the interests of American commerce, and also became a great favorite with the abler and more progressive and republican thinkers of France. Daniel Webster in referring to Jefferson's ministry at Paris said: "No court in Europe had at that time a representative in Paris commanding or enjoying higher regard for political knowledge or for general attainment than the Minister of this infant Republic."

VII. THE GREAT BATTLE FOR POPULAR GOVERNMENT.

It was while he was absent in France that his friend, James Madison, forwarded to him a draft of the Constitution. Jefferson was amazed and alarmed at its defects. There was no bill of rights properly safeguarding the liberties of the citizens or the States; no precautions against that deadly menace to a republic—a large standing army; no provisions against the curse of monopoly. Freedom of conscience and speech was not granted, and the right of habeas corpus was not made secure. Furthermore, there was no provision against Presidents succeeding themselves indefinitely. The absence of these things was well calculated to disquiet a statesman whose prevision was so keen and whose mind was so richly stored with the warnings

of history. Nevertheless he appreciated the perilous condition the country was in without a Constitution; so he reluctantly gave his support to the instrument, relying on amendments to remedy its dangerous defects.

When Washington entered upon his duties as first President of the infant Republic, Jefferson was urged to take the portfolio of State, which he very reluctantly accepted. Shortly after the assumption of this portfolio began that struggle of giants for supremacy in the nation, representing two opposing and mutually exclusive ideals of government, which became the chief source of bitterness in the Cabinet of the first President. The apostle of privilege, class rule, and centralization and the apostle of democracy soon found themselves differing at almost every point, because their fundamental conceptions of government were entirely unlike.

Alexander Hamilton, a man of splendid intellectual abilities, of imperious will, and of aristocratic tastes, as ambitious for military glory as he was autocratic in temper, was under the spell of the limited-monarchy idea. He was in spirit, taste, and temper monarchic or imperialistic, and his contempt for the masses—or the “mob,” as the early Federalists were pleased to term the people—was as sincere as was his deep-rooted distrust of them. The fact that he was sincere in these conclusions made him doubly dangerous. With him the old Tory citizens went heart and soul. They desired to make the best of what they considered the unhappy outcome of the war. With him naturally was ranged a large proportion of the wealthier citizens, as he was the special champion of the property class. He also attracted the shrewd financiers, who saw in his schemes golden opportunities for the acquisition of the special privileges and subsidies that would enrich the few, not infrequently at the expense of the many; while even more dangerous than all else to the cause of republicanism was the great number of high-minded patriots whose whole previous reading, training, and prejudices inclined them to Hamilton's view of class superiority and of the right of persons of property or means to arrogate rights denied their poorer brethren.

These theories were altogether abhorrent to Jefferson. He was too much of a philosopher, well versed in history and human life, to imagine that there could be any security or safety such as Hamilton imagined would exist under a firmly established property-holding class government. He knew, as every deeply thoughtful and philosophic student of history knows, that a ruling class, be it ever so wise and humane at the beginning, soon comes to legislate for its own interests and against those of the masses. He knew full well that the splendid new theory of government—that of liberty, justice, and fraternity for all the people—would rapidly resolve itself into an iridescent dream if the government became subservient or in any way limited to a privileged class, or was left to the administration of individuals not directly accountable to all the people.

Hamilton, though he had fought manfully for the adoption of the Constitution, was never satisfied with that instrument, because of its republican character. He had wished to make the offices of President and Senators dependent on good behavior, with provisions for removal only by impeachment, which would virtually mean life tenure. - He desired that no one but members of the propertied class should be allowed to vote for Senators, and that all State Governors should be appointed by the President. Other autocratic provisions were also desired. In a word, he wished to model our government as nearly as the American people would permit after the fashion of the limited monarchy of Great Britain, as he regarded that as the most admirable of governments. Hamilton's lack of confidence in his fellow-men, his sympathy with caste, aristocracy, and wealth, and the fact that his eyes were ever riveted on the past rather than the future, made him timid and fearful of any government not bulwarked by precedent and well-established examples.

On the other hand, Jefferson was a man of faith and conviction. He believed in the divinity of humanity. He had perfect confidence in the people, if equal and exact justice were guaranteed to every unit in the State. He knew that kingscraft, priestcraft, feudalism, aristocracy, autocracy, and in a

word all rulership of classes, had been oppressive, unjust, and unfavorable to the highest development of manhood and the rapid progress of civilization; and he believed that the path of safety lay along the line of freedom, fraternity, justice, and equality of rights and opportunities. Hence, though he was as dissatisfied with the Constitution as was Hamilton, it was for reasons diametrically opposed to those of the apostle of privilege, classes, and imperialistic ideals.

Hence, the struggle of the titans for principles that each held to be essential to the permanence of the new nation grew so fierce that Jefferson's life in the Cabinet was made the most miserable period in his long public career. So bitter at length became this contest that Jefferson resigned his position, not wishing longer to serve in a Cabinet whose discord he felt would itself prove disastrous to the best interests of the State. He did not retire, however, until he had aroused the masses to the extreme peril to republicanism arising from the determined attitude of Hamilton and his party of privilege and reactionary tendencies. As Jefferson had hoped to remedy the defects of the Constitution by amendments, Hamilton was determined to make the government stronger than the Constitution, and thus step by step gain through aggressive centralization, through precedents and the ever-growing power of class interests, the ends that he so devoutly desired at the outset and that Jefferson knew would be subversive of the fundamental principles of free government. The masterly opposition of the greatest exponent of faith in the people against the determined champion of class rule and imperialism checked Hamilton's victorious course ere its baleful influence had dominated the government.

Important as was his brave and determined course in uniting the fortunes of Virginia with those of Massachusetts when the latter colony was the special object of monarchic tyranny; helpful as were his efforts in securing the Standing Committee of Correspondence for the colonies; immensely valuable as was his "Summary View" to the cause of American freedom; essentially glorious as were his voicing of the New World pro-

test and proclamation in the Declaration of Independence; great and far-reaching for good as was his work as the pre-eminent leader in aggressive statesmanship in Virginia, which eventuated in religious freedom, the abolition of entail and primogeniture, and the provision for the equal division of inheritances; splendid as were his program for popular education and his plan for the abolition of slavery and the colonization of the negroes—all these services are overshadowed and eclipsed by his brave, masterly, and victorious stand for freedom against monarchic, reactionary, and class interests. This may indeed be said to be the supreme service he rendered in the founding of the greatest of modern nations; for his genius, courage, single-heartedness, patriotism, and loyalty to the lodestone of liberty and just government, guaranteeing equality of opportunity and rights to all citizens, served to beat back the baleful influences that in the light of history and the nature of society could only in the end have proved fatal to free government.

The owls and bats of reaction were put to flight, as were also the harpies of privilege and the cormorants of class interests, while the principles of free government were so clearly established in the imagination of the people that the high priest of the English system and the apostle of classes lost his sway over the nation. Mr. Jefferson, on the other hand, not only became the great leader and interpreter of democracy and the people's choice for Chief Executive for eight years, but the highest office in the Republic passed from him to Mr. Madison, his best-beloved and most devoted disciple, who in turn yielded it to another of Mr. Jefferson's friends and followers. And thus the reign of popular government and robust Americanism became so firmly established that until after the assassination of Abraham Lincoln—another apostle of freedom and champion of the common people—the Republic was the greatest moral world power of any age or time.

B. O. FLOWER.

Boston, Mass.

RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL LIBERTY IN RUSSIA.

THE discouraging experience the people of Canada have had with the Russian Doukhobors is apt to create in America a wrong impression as to the character and tendencies of the Russian Dissenters. To the friends of the Russian government the conduct of these fanatics of vegetarianism may furnish a ready excuse for, if not a justification of, the persecution to which they were subjected at home. Is it not singular, then, that these religious "cranks" are universal favorites with all non-office-holding, educated Russians, who as a rule are indifferent in religious matters?

For the last quarter of the century just past the religious movement among the common people has engaged the attention of the periodicals and the daily press. Writers of note have made its study their life-work, and the latest phase of Count Tolstoy's activity bears unmistakable marks of the influence of these simple folk upon the élite of the cultured class—the "intelliguentzia." A brief outline of the history and recent development of the "sectarian movement," as it is called in Russia, will therefore be not without interest.

The great Russian "schism," in official terminology, dates back from the latter part of the seventeenth century. There had been "heresies" before; and one, that of the "Judaizing," survived centuries of persecution. Yet those were small, isolated sects, without influence upon the people at large or the course of Russian history. The great religious movement of the "Old Ritualists," on the contrary, tore away from the Established Church great masses of orthodox adherents of the "old faith." The movement grew steadily in numbers, and all the efforts of the State to check its progress resulted only in the spread of "the ancient piety" to the outskirts of civilization. Russian expansion southward and eastward is greatly indebted to the indomitable spirit and perseverance of the thousands of "pilgrim fathers" who were driven to seek safety from persecution in the wilderness of the north and in the seclusion of the Ural Mountains.

The origin of the "schism" was purely ritual. The innovations introduced by Patriarch Nikon met with vigorous opposition from a part of the clergy; the controversy developed much bitterness on both sides, and finally led to the separation of a large and influential minority from the main body of the Orthodox Church. The majority of the communicants, ignorant of the law, accepted without challenge the authority of the ecclesiastical hierarchy; the dissenters carried with them such as were versed in Holy Writ and able to follow the niceties of the controversy. The union of Church and State naturally drew upon the latter the hostility of the dissenters. Peter the Great abolished the patriarchate and proclaimed himself the head of the Church. His reforms aiming at the Europeanization of Russia met with the opposition of the adherents of old customs. The immediate object of his reforms was the creation of a strong military empire, which imposed heavy burdens upon the taxpayers of the country. It became plain to those who could read the signs of the times in the light of the old faith that Antichrist had arrived in the flesh of the Czar. The "old believers" naturally became the spiritual leaders of the discontented in the numerous revolts against Peter the Great. Active resistance was crushed with an iron rod, but the spirit of active opposition strengthened by religious zeal could not be downed; persecution excited a thirst for martyrdom.

As time went on, the breach between the Established Church and the dissenters grew wider. In Russia, as elsewhere, doctrinal discussions led to multiplication of sects; thus the dissent, originating from a defense of literal orthodoxy, developed in the eighteenth century, and especially in the nineteenth, into a broad movement for religious reform. Though akin in spirit to the Reformation, this movement fed solely upon native sources until, a generation ago, the wave of western reformation reached Southern Russia.

A little over a century ago the territory extending southward from Little Russia to the Black Sea was under the rule of the Crimean Khans and sparsely populated by semi-nomadic Tartar tribes. When under Catherine II. the land was incorpor-

ated in the Russian Empire under the name of New Russia, the government, desiring to hasten the settlement of the country, granted special privileges and immunities to German immigrants. German colonies grew and flourished, and their orderliness and prosperity excited the admiration of their poor Russian neighbors. About the middle of the last century Baptist propaganda spread from the mother country to the German colonies. This coincided with the emancipation of the serfs in Russia.

The dependence of the serfs upon their lords in Russia was political in origin; the power to gather taxes and demand corvees from the villeins was granted to the lords in compensation for military or civil services. It was only in the eighteenth century that this political institution of the Muscovite State developed, through the reforms of Peter the Great (the "Anti-christ") and his successors, into an absolute title to the land upon which the peasants were settled. To the conservative peasant mind emancipation meant the abolition of the political power of the nobility over the tillers of the soil; the land was the Czar's and would remain so; the peasants would continue to hold and cultivate it, as a condition for performing their duties to the Czar.

Under the actual plan of emancipation, the land was evenly divided among the nobility and the peasantry and the latter were made to pay both for the land and the value of their services. This arrangement was contrary to all legal conceptions of the peasantry; they could not believe it to be the real will of the Czar; it appeared to them a huge fraud upon the Czar and his loyal people, concocted by the nobles. Thus the liberation of the serfs became the signal for a series of peasant riots and uprisings throughout the country.

The repression of this movement left the spirit of the peasantry dejected, and their conceptions of right and justice badly shattered. At this hour of doubt and despair the German Baptists brought to their neighbors the solace of the burdened and heavy laden of all ages—the word of the Son of Man crucified for Truth. The teachings of the Baptists rapidly spread from

village to village, from county to county, all over Southern Russia, under the name of "Stundism" (from the German *Stunde*, "hour," meaning the hour of reading of the Gospel). For the first time the Bible reached the Russian people in their native tongue; the Bible used in the orthodox Russian Church is in the "Church-Slavonic," *i. e.*, in ancient Bulgarian—not easily intelligible to the mass of the people. It was the first book that came to the people, and it gave them a philosophy of life and social relations. It gave them a new interest in life; drink, the only relaxation of a human beast of burden, lost all attraction for the regenerated peasants; mutual aid and coöperation, preached by the new religion, contributed their share to the improvement of their material condition.

Had the government let them alone, the Stundist movement would probably have remained confined within the field of evangelical work. This, however, was impossible—the Church, like the police, being a State institution. Apostasy from the Established Church is rebellion against the powers that be. The orthodox priests, aided by the police and the courts, entered upon a vigorous campaign of persecution, with the result that the Stundist movement is now repeating the course of the Reformation in England: purely religious non-conformity is developing into political and social radicalism.

From association with their foreign brethren the Russian Baptists gained some knowledge of the political institutions of other countries, where the State does not interfere with the religious beliefs of its citizens. The revolutionary agitation of the '70s and the '80s, though confined to the educated classes in the great cities, awakened among the Stundist peasants an interest in political questions. They sought information upon the live problems of the day in secular books and the periodical press. To-day the naïve ignorance of the rustics is gone; one meets among their representative men the same comprehension of political and social problems and the same schools of thought as among the "intelliguentzia" (the college-bred class). There are among them moderate liberals, with whom the paramount issue is the separation of the Church from the State and

a constitutional government, as a guaranty of religious and civil liberty. There are followers of Henry George—whose ideas, by the way, had been anticipated by the Russian "Land and Liberty Society" in the '70s; the priority of that revolutionary society is acknowledged in George's "Progress and Poverty." There are Christian Socialists, who remind one of Mayor Jones, of Toledo. There are those who believe in revolutionary action, some even going so far as to justify the acts of the Terrorists.

This fact is of the greatest significance to the coming political development of Russia. Heretofore opposition to autocracy was confined to the great cities, while the government was backed by the passive support of an ignorant peasantry. The development of political aspirations among the Stundists brings into the ranks of the opposition the most intelligent class of the Russian peasantry, whose influence is spreading in spite of persecution. The labor movement, which came upon the wave of industrial expansion in the last decade of the last century, and the spread of Socialism among the workers of the cities, have had the support of the Stundists, who are numerous in all southern towns. The current from the country to the city, which is characteristic of all modern nations, gains additional force in Russia from her long winters; there is a vast class of peasants who seek temporary employment in the city and return to the country for the farming season. In the absence of a free press and of the privacy of the mails these workers are so many "walking delegates" of political agitation, too numerous to be spotted out by the most watchful police.

A handful of "Nihilists," recruited from among the college-bred class, could easily be exterminated: the Baptists cannot be exterminated. The demand for religious and political liberty is growing among the masses of the Russian people, from whom the soldiery are recruited; hence, the day may come when the army can no longer be relied upon to suppress the agitation for popular government.

I. A. HOURWICH.

Washington, D. C.

FREE SOCIALISM.

ALL that Socialism needs to make it acceptable to the masses of the people is to remove the erroneous conception prevalent concerning it. The work before every advocate of this system is to carry on a constant labor of education, for the supporters of the present capitalistic system have placed Socialism in a false position upon every available occasion.

Socialism would bring into existence a state of society in which all people would perform some useful and productive labor, either manual or mental, and the wealth of each would be based upon and proportionate to the labor of each; but in no case could any one who did not labor secure the fruit of toil of those who work. Do not become possessed of the erroneous impression that Socialists recognize only physical labor; they recognize as clearly as any one the importance and usefulness of the mental labor of direction, administration, superintendence, and invention. They emphasize the importance of all these when usefully applied, and advocate their due reward; but they do not believe in the reward of mental labor when directed to efforts by which one person tries to secure the wealth another's labor has produced.

Socialists claim that under the present capitalistic organization of society those who work the hardest and produce the most, whether it be in the department of physical labor or creative art and invention, possess the least; while those who work the least in genuine, useful effort possess the most. Socialism contends that all wealth is produced by labor, and therefore that all wealth should belong to labor.

Under the present form of society there are three special institutions by means of which the non-producers secure the wealth of those who produce; *viz.*, Rent, Interest, and Profit. Under Socialism these institutions would be abolished. Realizing the impossibility of removing the effect without first de-

stroying the cause, Socialism does not undertake to abolish these institutions as long as the conditions that create them remain; therefore, they go to the fundamental cause, the root of the evil, and would destroy it.

First, then, under Socialism only those who *use* the land could own it, and then only in the sense of an equity consisting of the value of the wealth their labors had produced upon it. No less an authority than Blackstone says that the original title to land was given upon possession and use. The only justification for a title to land is to protect the owner in the possession of the labor values he has produced upon it and of necessity attached to it. But this protection can be secured far more justly by having the absolute title vested in the State and granting the possessor a lease in perpetuity so long as he complies with the conditions of occupancy and use.

Socialism does not necessarily mean that all persons engaged in agricultural and kindred pursuits must do so as employees of the State, upon a wage basis and under the direction of State managers. It would permit of such collective labors upon petition of a sufficient number of persons who evinced a desire to work in that manner, but such operations would be purely voluntary upon the part of those who participated. In time such associated efforts would demonstrate their greater superiority, but, until all were convinced of the desirability and higher efficiency of collective grouping and voluntarily entered into formed groups, individuals could lease their lands in perpetuity from the State and labor according to their own methods. And, having once entered into collective groups, they could at proper times drop out and return again to individual efforts.

Under such a system of land tenure all speculation in land would cease, and all idle and unimproved lands would be open to settlement. No one could sell the land he possessed, but only the labor values thereon, and all such transfers would have to receive the sanction of the State to secure equity. It is plain that, under such a system of land ownership and tenure, rents would cease and the first and most powerful instrument

by means of which those who do not labor secure the products of those who do labor would be abolished. Under this system the actual farmer now in possession of and using his land would experience no change; so long as he complied with a statute of uses, he would remain in undisturbed possession, but all who held land out of use would be forced to use it. As the amount of land one man can use is comparatively limited, capitalistic landlords would be forced to surrender their leased possessions.

But, it is objected, this is confiscation and unjust. Now, no one is moved by stronger motives of justice than the Socialist—the very spirit of Socialism is to secure justice; and, while the property of the capitalist landlord may have been secured unjustly by the exploitation of those who labor, the Socialist is willing in order to avoid violence to give the expropriated owner compensation. This could be paid by compelling all tenants of such property to pay the former owner an annuity continuing for a period of years, each payment reducing the amount of the owner's original equity until entirely paid for. Thus the land would pass from a capitalistic system, where the simple fact of ownership enables the fortunate owner to draw a regular and continuous income without the performance of any labor, to a socialistic system where the State holds it in trust for actual users.

With this first great and fundamental reform in land ownership, not only rent would be abolished but also most of the underlying causes that produce interest. Interest is based upon the assumption that when the owner turns wealth as capital over to some one else he loses its reproductive and multiplying power, and that the user should reimburse him for the gain he thus foregoes. But wealth in itself, without labor, is absolutely inert and impotent, and not only fails to increase, but unless used will decay and waste away. The supporters of interest say labor could do nothing without capital, and therefore should pay for its use. Their statement is fallacious and inverted. Capital could not do anything without labor, and labor saves it from perishing. Therefore, instead of de-

manding compensation from labor for the use of capital, the owner of capital should pay labor for preserving it. This he can do by allowing it to be used with the condition only that it will be returned, not diminished in value. Yet under Socialism no one would be compelled to allow others to use his accumulated wealth without interest, but conditions would be established that would cause him gladly to do so voluntarily. This would be accomplished by the people collectively owning and operating a sufficient number of the means of production and distribution to employ all who had no capital, which it would allow them to use free of all charges above cost of maintaining without depreciation in value. No one would pay individuals interest for the use of capital when the Social State was ready to provide it free. Yet by its very nature the capital of individuals would have to be used to be preserved, and, as an individual could use only so much, he would be glad to loan others all in excess of what he himself could use without interest and simply upon the condition that it be returned to him unimpaired or of equal value.

By these two methods of land ownership and tenure and the collective ownership and operation of sufficient capital to employ all who have no capital, the two great sources by means of which those who do not labor secure the wealth produced by those who do labor are abolished, and without taking away the freedom of any who may prefer to labor as individuals. They would even be free to associate and form partnerships, companies, and corporations, if they could get any one to work for them—which, however, would be improbable, not from constraint but from conditions; for who would work for an individual or firm, where his employer must of necessity retain a portion of the wealth he produces to make his profits, when the collective State was standing ready to employ him without retaining any portion of the wealth he produced?—for under Socialism all undertakings by the State would be run without profit over and above the cost of maintaining the original capital unimpaired. All profits of the capitalistic system would disappear, going either to the employees or the consumers. Yet

it would be well, and not necessarily destructive of the Socialistic State, to allow individual methods of production and distribution under the conditions imposed; for if such individual efforts could compete with the organized industries of the State, operating upon a large scale and under the most favorable conditions, it would indicate a deficient State management that the people would have to replace. Conditions would then truly resolve themselves into a struggle in which the individual methods of production and distribution would have to compete with social coöperative methods, and the fittest would survive. It is not difficult to see which this would be; inevitably the Social State would prevail.

The industries that Socialism would first find it expedient to own and operate would necessarily be those requiring large aggregations of employees and monopolistic under the present system, such as railroads, telegraph and telephone lines, steamships, mines, oil wells, and industries producing the basic articles of our commercial and industrial life. These industries could be expropriated and paid for upon the same plan as the land: a series of annuities payable out of the former profits of the undertakings, all being operated upon this basis until the compensation had been paid.

In addition to the foregoing legislation, Socialism would have general laws applicable to all municipalities requiring the local authorities, upon petition of a specified number of citizens, to establish trade stores and warehouses for the storage and distribution of all commodities at cost, including the services of actual employees. By this method all unnecessary middlemen, now non-producers and consequently a burden upon those who do produce, would be forced to seek useful employment, which they could secure without difficulty as the State industries would be ready to receive them if they did not choose to employ themselves individually upon the land.

Any one can see that the vast number of retailers and their clerks and employees perform the office of distributing agents for us, yet under the present system their number is many times in excess of actual and efficient needs. Who in private

business would think of employing twenty persons to do what one could perform equally well? This useless burden upon producers should be removed. At the same time these numerous middlemen, while performing the functions of agents for us, are irresponsible in the sense that they are under no obligations to look after our interests. Every incentive to adulteration and imposition is placed before them, while under the Socialistic system they would have no other motive than the best interest of the people who employed them. The policies of Socialism would aim to get all products and commodities from producer to consumer by the most direct and economical route possible, in order to avoid all waste and useless burdens upon production.

Thus, with rent, interest, and profits eliminated from our social system and the means of industry free to all who desire to labor, the Socialist sees a State in which labor receives the full product of its toil and all exchanges are of equal value and different in kind only. At the same time he sees conditions that give free play to the greatest diversity of natures—the philosopher, if he choose, tilling his little plot of land for the meager products necessary to supply his wants, and the captain of industry earning the highest fame by organizing and administering the great industries of the State.

WILLIAM L. GARVER.

Chillicothe, Mo.

TRUE PATRIOTISM AND GOOD CITIZENSHIP.

SINCE the time when men first banded themselves together to establish government and enact laws for protection, national patriotism has been an incentive to eloquence, self-sacrifice, and daring deeds. This human emotion, like the others, is somewhat spasmodic in its degree of intensity. At some periods of national existence it seems to slumber, while at other times, aroused by some crisis, it becomes the most fierce of human passions. A series of political and industrial events that have transpired in our national life during the last few years has resulted in a general awakening of the American people along patriotic lines. Relying as we do upon the proper education of the coming generation to perpetuate our institutions, it is but natural, perhaps, that we should hear much about teaching the youth of the land love of their country and their country's flag. The flag is unfurled daily from the schoolhouses, and parents and school-teachers alike are urged to instruct young people to revere the flag and honor their country. All this is well. Far be it from my intention to deprecate any act that will instil in the mind of youth a wholesome regard for that emblem that floats over the greatest republic known to man, that stands for the grandest institutions under the light of the sun, that has been bathed in the blood of countless patriots, and that has been borne to victory in some of the most glorious battles ever fought for righteous principles and the emancipation and elevation of humanity.

But there is something more to true patriotism than that passionate love for flag and country which prompts men to leave home and comfort, and everything dear to them, and to march forth to do battle, suffer privation, and even die for the perpetuity of the Republic and its principles. That sort of patriotism lies dormant in the breast of every good citizen and

flashes up spontaneously when cause is given. It is not likely that our country will ever lack for martial defenders in case of assault from within or without. We were told a few years ago that in our mad rush for the almighty dollar our natures had become sordid and would not respond to a call to arms in an hour of need. Yet, a few years ago, when that battle-ship was blown up in Havana harbor, and two hundred and sixty-three American sailors were killed, what an uprising there was in the land! The bellicose nature of man is still too strong not to be fired with that fierce passion, amounting almost to an uncontrollable frenzy, when insult is offered to his country or to himself. Still, the fact may remain true that our patriotic impulses have become somewhat dulled on account of our desperate struggles for position, power, and wealth, but we hardly think it has much, if any, bearing upon our martial patriotism. Neither are we willing to concede that this national scramble for self-advancement has to any great extent obliterated our sense of justice and moral rectitude. It can still be counted to a certainty that the great mass of the American people will be found on the right side of any strictly moral question when once they "see the light," as witness the almost universal support given President Roosevelt in his contest with a few refractory Senators over Cuban reciprocity. The trouble is that the present trend of American life along lines of self-aggrandizement has by degrees brought about such a social condition that we are growing less and less susceptible to the urgency of problems demanding high, unselfish, patriotic consideration.

We believe that our country at present stands in dire need of the earnest cultivation of that homely, every-day patriotism that should lead men in their daily life to leave no effort unattempted to raise the standard of citizenship to such a point that men will be willing to make their own selfish ambitions and purposes subservient to their country's welfare. This standard of citizenship will not be established by the number or eminence of our political leaders; it will not be raised by the eloquence and wisdom of our statesmen, nor will it be maintained by our

wealthy philanthropists. It will be determined by the degree of faithfulness with which every sovereign citizen of the Republic discharges the individual responsibilities that he assumes when he arrives at an age when our Government recognizes in him a responsible factor in the management of its affairs. There is no danger of establishing too lofty an ideal of such responsibility in the mind of youth. The urgent need of such ideals was brought to the public mind with startling force a few months ago, when a half dozen men appeared before our President and with an audacity amounting almost to insult talked flippantly of their "property rights," which, regardless of their bearing upon the public welfare, should enable them to continue a condition in the anthracite regions that threatened the very life of thousands of honest citizens who had no part in the controversy these men were maintaining. If these men had been thoroughly imbued with that unselfish patriotism which should lead men to have respect for the brotherhood of mankind, to sacrifice private ambition for public good, and to humble their pride before their country's altar, it seems incredible that they could have taken the stand they apparently did.

But the selfish disregard for the rights of others so manifest in the action of these men was, unfortunately, not peculiar to them alone. It is only because their actions touched the public in a particularly tender spot that they became marked and brought down upon themselves the wrath of the people. A few months previously it was the set of men who composed the Beef Trust that were the objects of special condemnation. To-morrow it may be still another set of men that will meet the disapprobation of an avenging public. Nor is it alone on the part of such magnates that we find this spirit of obdurate disregard for whomsoever may be trampled under their feet in the rush for "success." It is just possible that the men maintaining the other side of the anthracite argument may not at all stages of the proceedings have been actuated by the highest patriotic regard for the welfare of their countrymen. There is not a State, city, town, or hamlet in which there cannot be

found a class determined to carry out its own schemes regardless of the effects upon society or individuals. The strong are trampling upon the rights of the weak, and the weak are snapping back with almost fiendish hatred. The employer too often treats the laborer as an inanimate machine, and the laborer in turn plots ruin to the employer's interests. Fie on the patriotism of men who boast of the love of flag and country on the Fourth of July, and who by their every-day relations to their fellow-men bring about a condition of society that strikes at the very vitals of their Government!

And in this fight for position, domination, and power too often the very laws of the country are wilfully broken or evaded. At present the best legal minds available are being used by the Government to devise laws that will protect the interests of the people against the machinations of such of those great corporations as are striving to further their greedy schemes at the expense of the public. At the same time another class of men equally brilliant is being paid fabulous sums by these corporations to find loop-holes in the law by which they can evade its intent and carry on their nefarious methods. But again this evasion of law is not monopolized by the monopolists. Nor, on the other hand, is disregard for law the exclusive weapon of strikers and mobs. It is going on to a certain extent every day, everywhere, and is practised by the so-called respectable citizens of the country. Any one who observes the trend of affairs in his own locality must be cognizant of this fact. It is the result of the twentieth-century "fight for position" mania, to which end self and selfish aims and ambitions are placed above duty to the country and its laws. A prominent candidate for a high office is reported as saying recently: "The era of the young man is at hand. He may have to fight for position and perhaps for existence, but in the end he is bound to win if he is persistent and never lets up." Perhaps this is true, and perhaps it is well; but does the gentleman not know that in the course of this fight this young man who does win is bound to displace and make vindictive a hundred other worthy ones, and that the very spirit that such

a fight engenders will produce that stubbornness and selfishness which so actuated the coal barons as seemed to blind them to duty to their country and fellow-men? It is in just such strife that lofty patriotism is lost sight of in an unnatural fight for the gratification of greed and power.

The energetic man should be encouraged, and should have the legitimate fruit of his energy and push; but it does not follow that he may carry it so far that he shall forget his obligations to his country, nor that he should forget that obligation to his country includes an obligation to every citizen of that country. The nation should not be considered an abstract thing represented by a "flag" to which alone the citizen is to pay homage. He should rather pay allegiance to the nation as a great family, and should remember, when fighting for position, that it is incumbent upon each to look somewhat to the welfare of the other members of that brotherhood. If the individual would but realize that he alone has obligations to his country and to his fellow-men, no matter what his station may be,—responsibilities so peculiar to himself that he cannot shirk them without in some degree lowering the standard of his country,—then there would be fewer causes for arbitration. This lesson we should learn: We are not required to respect the personalities of all people, but we should respect the inalienable rights of every citizen, and doing that we will display the highest order of patriotism.

Alas! we are hapless shirks when it comes to discharging the every-day, common responsibilities we owe to our country. We condemn the acts of the Government, not considering that we ourselves are the Government, and that in condemning it we are most likely censuring the result of some derelict act on our own part. We sneer at the inefficacy of the laws and impugn the sincerity and honesty of the lawmakers, overlooking the fact that we by right are the makers of the lawmakers and have the power to *unmake* if they do not meet the requirements. We impeach the acts and motives of the men holding the elective offices, and remain away from caucus and polls. As I write I can hear at intervals the booming of a cannon dis-

charged to force upon the minds of voters the fact that unless they are registered to-night they cannot vote at the coming election; yet withal thousands will hold so lightly their responsibilities as sovereign citizens that they will thus disfranchise themselves. We think the only way to serve the country is in an exalted position, forgetting that this is a Government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," that upon the people rests and must ever rest the responsibility of the accomplishment of the purposes for which the Government exists,—the welfare and protection of the whole people and their rights,—and that so far as we fail to perform our every duty as free citizens will the standard be lowered. Every one knows that the words of the most gifted platform orator would have little effect upon his audience if the *janitor* did not do *his* duty and have the condition of the auditorium such as to put the hearers in a receptive mood. Neither can the legislative and executive officers, even with the best of motives, do much toward the betterment of existing or undesirable conditions, unless we as individual citizens do our part to put the public in a receptive mood for better things. This we will do, if we will but turn the light within and discharge our individual responsibilities as shown by that light as conscientiously as we expect those in high places to discharge theirs.

This would seem to be a propitious time for the awakening of the people along such lines. With such flagrant examples of unpatriotic action as that of the coal barons and their kind to arouse our indignation, may we not hope that the people will take new obligations upon themselves, that the wonderful patriotism that dominated our forefathers may again obtain, and that the grand old Ship of State may go proudly on to the fulfilment of her manifest destiny—that of guiding star to the universe of nations?

JOHN T. YATES.

Jamestown, N. Y.

A FEDERATION OF LABOR.

THE status of capital seems to be firmly established under the law of social development. It has but one interest, and all its movements indicate that it is thoroughly class-conscious with regard thereto. Wherever it is threatened it is a unit in defense of its rights. Its defenses are the strongest; its sentinels are always posted, and their watches are untiring. There is no point at which an attack might be made on it that all its forces would not immediately be concentrated in its defense. Its army of defenders is comparatively small, but thoroughly disciplined and trustworthy. Its present condition of solidarity marks its obedience to the law of evolution, which has brought it by slow processes of integration to its present state. To-day it is a concrete whole, admitting of no divisions of interest or action. It is not possible to arouse a spirit of antagonism between parts of it interested in one enterprise against other parts interested in some other enterprise. Whatever objects it has to gain, all its parts move as a harmonious whole. All nations operate their machinery at its beck and in its interest. Legislatures, administrators, and judges are its servants. It brooks no opposition.

The fact of its establishment under the law of evolution is no longer denied or even doubted; like every other social factor, like everything that exists, it is a creature of law and must obey the law. It is subject to the law of integration and its concomitant, and like all moving things it is subject to the law of moving bodies. It is imperative that it should integrate, and it is equally imperative that it should move along the line of least resistance or the line of greatest traction.

There is but one kind of capital, no matter how minutely political economists and financiers may divide and subdivide its phases. Its sole end is investment, no matter what name may be given to that use of it. Its manner of gaining return on the investment may in one case be called rent, in another

interest, in another profit, and so on; but the object of its employment is that it may bring return—and that fact makes such employment an act of investment. Wherever, however, and by whomsoever employed, its interests are one and never separable; for the one thing sought by putting it to use is that it may bring the owner some gain or return. It is ever in harmony with itself. It is never disturbed by questions of ethics; it is like a spoiled child—it *wants*, and whatever it wants it is determined to have. It never discusses right or wrong; it *determines*, and there is no argument after that. It has erected its defenses, and they are impregnable; it mans them, and its soldiers are unconquerable. It is so solidified that, if it be attacked by anybody or at any point, all its resources and all its strength are instantaneous in resistance.

What a power is wielded by capital! Governments are its subjects; all the equipments of nations are the ready tools to execute its will. Legislatures are as submissive to it as if they lived not in free times and under enlightened constitutions. Emperors, kings, presidents, governors, and the lowest municipal officers bow their heads before it. Courts have been fashioned for it; judges are the humblest of all its slaves.

Why do we utter these truths? We behold capital in all its phases; we survey it in its relations to all the other factors of the social life; we compare it with other elements of our civilization, marvel at the perfection of its mechanism, and are stunned at the speed of its movement toward an inexorable destiny. We know that it is now doing what all things in the material universe have done before it—making haste toward a state of integration, and, while doing so, choosing lines of least resistance or greatest traction.

Since the commercial age was ushered in, the progress toward the unification of the interests of capital has been more rapid than that of civilization itself. It has laid hold of everything that could serve it, and that which it has seized it has never released; and, so far as the concomitant elements of civilization have permitted,—for these have generally been obstructions to its progress,—it is a marvel of evolutionary ad-

vancement. Its greatest hold on the world has been gained in the last fifty years, during which time it undermined empires and prostituted all the machinery of government, besides grinding the material substance, even life itself, out of the majority of the human race.

But it is not the writer's intention to enumerate its wrongs to the social body, nor even to devote space to criticisms of it. The real object is to present an outline, and then draw a lesson from its development that will give the cue to other social factors. The need that this lesson be learned is great and pressing. Capital is a social instrument enjoyed and held by a few, while the great remainder of the world's population is victimized by its brutality. Brutality is an incident of the peculiar functions of capital under our system of inhumanity, and does not inhere in capital *per se*. Capital in a true social organism would be its benefactor, while as now organized it is an oppressor.

As if patterning after capital, now come other social factors. We behold the instruments of production and distribution, in their efforts to escape the ruinous effects of "free competition," flying to the city of refuge to which capital had previously taken itself—consolidation, which under the law is known as *integration*. Here we see the distinctively commercial interests learning the lesson that no two bodies can expand their forces against each other without mutual loss, and that the competitive world is filled with irrefutable proof that all the examples of business competition result only in losses.

And so we proceed from one social factor to another, and everywhere is presented the spectacle of this one or that one moving toward integration. What does it mean that every little collection of individuals gives forth some manifestation of its repugnance to individualism, if it be not to accentuate the destiny of the race in closer social relations and consequent wider social functions? Does it not mean that the slower factors, following the lead of others, are yielding to integration? While this seems to be the rule with all factors called "commercial," there are others much slower still; and

we see others that have hardly begun the movement. Our great agricultural population is in the last class. While many functions formerly performed by individuals have been taken from them, and while better tools of production are used by them, they have not yet become class-conscious, as has capital, and in some degree wage labor. This class has not yet been buffeted severely enough to cause it to seek easier paths. Then, besides, its units are so widely scattered that it has not had the opportunity for reciprocal intercourse that exists in more congested communities.

But now we reach a class that, next to capital, shows its subjection to the law of evolution, though it may well be doubted if it is conscious of the fact. This doubt is sustained when we take into account the many frictions arising between separate conventional divisions of this element. Reference is now made to the *labor class*. Its organizations, both national and local, effected to resist the encroachments of capital, are signs of the process of integration designed at a future day to bring its units into close and reciprocal relations. With the struggle it now has with capital it lacks much of making the presentation of force of which it is undoubtedly capable. It is too much divided in directness and unity of effort to make the best possible resistance, and is far from being moved by a oneness of interest. It is yet in an early stage of integration, and, unlike capital, is unable to direct its forces, as a unit, against one point of attack; and until the knowledge that all labor is of a single kind, and until the spirit of oneness takes possession of all the different orders of labor, it will be impossible for it to exert itself effectively against any antagonistic element.

How soon labor will be moved by a plan that will be based on a unity of interest—which will recognize that every one who labors should be under the fullest protection of but *one* organization of labor, with one head, one plan, and one object to be attained—is not within the limits of positive prediction. But until labor has reached that state of class-consciousness which will impel it to effect one organization rep-

resenting every salaried brain-worker as well as the humblest laborer in the land; until labor has done that which capital, its only aggressive antagonist, has done; until there is but one federation of labor in our country, including in its ranks *all* labor, without distinction of occupation—it will not be possible for it to make itself felt to the fullest in its contests with capital. When it has learned the lesson that capital teaches—that there is no effectiveness in opposition unless it come from united ranks; when it has learned that to protect the interest of one of its branches, it is necessary that all labor shall be united in its demand—then shall we see labor obtaining its every demand without recourse to the strike or the boycott.

This federation of the producers is a necessary lesson to be learned from the class-conscious consolidation of capital. When this day comes we shall hear that *labor* is sensitive wherever its interests are involved, and all the talk about capital being exclusively so will no longer be heard. Then speed the day of the organization of *all* the producers of the land into one federation! If such an organization now existed it would be the director of all the interests of the nation, as it should be of all the nations of the world.

If we apply the law of social development to the present-day labor organizations we are forced to admit that they are far from showing as high a state of organization as that exhibited by capital. That the labor interests of the country are represented by innumerable bodies is indisputable; that labor fails at critical times to recognize that its complete success depends on concentrated action is also indisputable; that it has not yet realized that if it were as united as capital its victories would be as complete seems clear—for until its recognition of the law of evolution is as thorough as that of capital its defeats will be many. Therefore, it seems to be demanded that labor shall evolve itself into *one* organization, and that it should stand as a unit in pressing the demand of any of its several divisions or of any individual among its members.

JAMES A. SLANKER.

Joplin, Mo.

A CONVERSATION

WITH

C. Y. ROOP,

Editor of "The Co-operative Journal,"

ON

THE ROCHDALE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT IN CALIFORNIA.

Q. Mr. Roop, California has taken the lead in the Rochdale coöperative movement of the New World, and I am sure that our readers will be deeply interested in knowing the present status of the work in your State. Will you kindly tell us something of the condition of the movement. What is the volume of business for the present year?

A. Yes, California has taken the lead in the Rochdale co-operative movement; and though, as has been the usual experience with pioneer movements, and especially with attempts at coöperation, the movement in its earlier stages was marked by many vicissitudes, for some time our growth has been steady and healthy, while with the multiplication of successful stores the volume of business is rapidly increasing. During the last year it amounted to about one million dollars.

Q. What were the profits realized?

A. About twenty per cent. When the people are made to realize by means of practical illustration that they can enjoy the great benefits accruing from reduced expenditure incident to combination or union, and the vast sums of money that for generations have been going to enrich middlemen while the producers have remained comparatively poor, they will not be slow to unite enthusiastically in coöperative movements, as is

seen in the rapid increase in coöperative work in Great Britain and elsewhere during recent years.

Q. I am glad to know that the volume of business has already reached so commanding a figure, and especially is it gratifying to know that it is steadily gaining. May I inquire what is the proportion of increase?

A. It is now more than doubling each year.

Q. How many coöperative stores are there in California, and which are doing the largest business?

A. We have now over fifty stores in this State. Those at Los Angeles, Sacramento, Fresno, Grass Valley, and Kingsbury are carrying on the largest business.

Q. I infer from what you have said that the movement is in a most healthy and flourishing condition?

A. It certainly is. As yet we have given little attention to manufacturing, except in our creameries; but doubtless the day is not distant when the coöperators of California will be a large factor in the manufacturing interests of the Pacific Coast.

Q. Has the coöperative movement extended along the Pacific Coast to any extent outside of California?

A. Yes. Oregon and Washington are rapidly organizing, and there are already several stores in Nevada, Utah, and Idaho.

Q. Are there many manifestations of the coöperative spirit and interest in coöperation outside of the Rochdale stores?

A. Oh, yes. The leaven of coöperation is working among our people, and the logic of events no less than the instinct of self-preservation is exercising a strong influence in favor of coöperation. There are several coöperative fruit exchanges. One in the southern part of the State last year did a business of nine million dollars. There can be no mistaking the fact that coöperation is rapidly taking hold of the public imagination, especially among the more thoughtful people, in all classes of life; and this is to me the most encouraging sign of the times. Coöperation is the greatest cause of the twentieth century. The greatest difficulty we have had to encounter has been the lack of means properly to disseminate a knowledge of the truth.

Wherever we have been able liberally to distribute educational literature, public interest has been aroused. I heartily wish that some Carnegie might arise with millions to flood the land with the glorious doctrine of commercial salvation. Slow as the work has been in the past, it is quite evident that the change is coming, and I believe it is coming more rapidly than most of us have dreamed that it would.

TOPICS OF THE TIMES.

BY B. O. FLOWER.

A CITY ROBBED OF FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS FOR LACK OF MAJORITY RULE.

So long as the corporations and the political "boss," through the party machine, rule, the cities will be plundered by the monopolies, and the people's representatives will degenerate into bands of thieves who will wax fat through bribery. We have had many startlingly impressive illustrations of this character during the last few years, notably in Philadelphia, Minneapolis, and St. Louis.

In the latter city, for example, according to a prominent St. Louis banker quoted by Mr. Lincoln Steffens in his excellent article in *McClure's Magazine*, on "The Shamelessness of St. Louis," "fifty million dollars' worth of franchises and municipal assets" have been given to corporations by the people's representatives, who individually received large bribes in consideration of thus handing over to a few individuals enormously valuable franchises that, if operated by the people or sold or leased at a reasonable figure, would have reduced the taxes to a minimum or have supplied the treasury of the city with enormous sums for schools, museums, libraries, and parks.

Had the people the right of initiative and referendum, this carnival of corruption and robbery could not have prevailed. We know of no instance where the people, when they have had the opportunity to vote directly on a question involving disposing themselves of valuable property without compensation, have not overwhelmingly refused to entertain the corporations' pleas.

The fifty million dollars lost to the people of St. Louis through the bribery of city officials by the corporations is typical of the vast sums that our present system of legislation is costing the public, while it also affords an equally impressive illustration of the demoralization and corrupting effect of corporation and ring rule, or representative rule instead of government through direct legislation.

The corporations' tools and apologists are in the habit of ob-

jecting to giving the people the right to initiate and to veto legislation on the pretext of the expense that the extra elections would involve. As a matter of fact, instead of direct legislation proving a great additional expense to the public, it is safe to say that it would result in saving the people many millions of dollars that are now annually given away by legislators and municipal authorities to corporations and special class interests.

There are three reasons that make the campaign for Majority Rule supremely important:

(1) It is imperatively demanded in order to preserve the fundamental principles of free government. Without it the people are not the real governors or rulers. The masters are the corporations that rule the party "bosses" and political machines and that dictate the persons who shall make and execute the laws.

(2) On considerations of public economy these strictly republican measures are urgently demanded. The carnival of loot that has made multimillionaires of scores of persons, who by bribery, direct or indirect, have gained and are gaining for nothing inestimably valuable special privileges, must be stopped. The hope of relief for the people from the tyranny and oppression of the trusts and monopolies lies in the prompt enactment of Majority Rule legislation, which is thoroughly feasible through the Winnetka method of procedure.

(3) The corruption of the people's representatives will rapidly spread and the virus most deadly to national integrity and perpetuity will quickly permeate society, unless the people promptly assert the fundamental demand underlying all true republics or free governments—that of the sovereign right of the people to initiate and to pass upon such legislation as changing conditions and the good of the State demand. Freedom cannot live in the midst of general official corruption, and human rights will be brutally ignored unless the people have the direct and ultimate vote on measures of importance.

The amazing revelations of corruption in St. Louis and other great American municipalities are typical and warn the friends of republican institutions that they have slept overlong and that only by resolute and wise action can the splendid heritage of our fathers be restored and maintained. Through Majority Rule the citizens of the Republic will become, as they are in Switzerland, the real rulers, and the power of the corporations will be destroyed.

Mr. Folk, the noble and incorruptible State's attorney for St. Louis, who has not only unmasked the wholesale bribery of the "boss," the city legislators, and the corporations in that city, but who has convicted a large number of the guilty parties, gives it as his conviction that "ninety-nine per cent. of the people are honest; only one per cent. are dishonest." Mr. Folk has convicted every man he has tried before a jury. He is convinced that the people as yet are sound, but they lack leadership. They have been under the rule of the "boss" and the party machine, and have no leaders, organizers, or patriotic apostles of justice and freedom to enthuse them with the old-time spirit and arouse in them a passion for those great fundamental verities that made our revolutionary era one of the most inspiring moments in the world's history.

But it is a noticeable fact that, wherever the people have been allowed directly to vote on any issue that has been clearly presented, they have evinced soundness of judgment. A notable example of this kind was seen in the city of Boston, when the street-railway corporation made one of the most desperate fights it has ever attempted in order to secure the right to relay tracks on certain streets. All the press of the city, with one exception,—and that exception a journal not enjoying a very great circulation,—became special pleaders for the corporation. A small band of patriotic citizens, with comparatively small funds at their command, attempted to enlighten the electorate by sending to all voters a Socratic discussion covering the main points involved. The result was that the electorate voted against the corporation's program by almost a two-to-one vote.

Majority Rule is the blade that will strike down the upas tree of political corruption and corporate domination. It will avert from our Republic the greatest dangers that have menaced free government since the foundation of this nation, and will open the way for continuous progress through peaceful education.

* * *

LIGHT DAWNING IN THE FAR EAST.

The seeds sown by Tolstoy and the martyrs of freedom and justice throughout darkest Russia are already bearing fruit. Our readers will remember that several months ago we called attention to one of the most sublimely heroic tragedies of modern times, in which a company of Russian soldiers refused to

shoot down their starving countrymen because the latter had tumultuously demanded food and fuel for their starving and freezing wives and children, and had coupled the demand with the threat that if their petition were unheeded they would help themselves to the grain in the full storehouses of their rich masters and would take wood from the great forests that surrounded them. The soldiers, it will be remembered, refused to shoot their countrymen at the behest of the rich and powerful, though they knew that refusal meant death or imprisonment and exile; and as a result one in every ten men was shot and the rest were condemned to penal servitude.

Such displays of heroism, in which men choose death rather than to commit crimes against their unfortunate brothers, have a divine potency that exerts a marvelous influence over the conscience force in a people; and this deed of lofty manhood, together with the nation's monstrous crime, served greatly to augment the seething discontent of the millions throughout Russia.

For many months the most disquieting tales of rising discontent have poured into St. Petersburg from almost all quarters of the realm. The threatened revolt became so giant-like that the hitherto all-powerful bureaucracy became appalled. Something had to be done, and done speedily, or a nation-wide revolution would surely ensue. The specter of the French Revolution rose before the Czar and his autocratic councilors. It was by no means a pleasing vision, and in order to escape the present peril they determined to act. Accordingly the two most urgent demands—those of religious freedom and of a measure of democratic rule in communal life not hitherto permitted—were taken under consideration; hence the double rescript of the Czar, one apparently dealing a heavy blow to the arrogant, intolerant, and oppressive State Church, the other seemingly permitting the entering wedge of popular government to be inserted into the trunk of absolutism.

Whether these proposed measures are intended merely to quiet the present storm by pretended rather than real reforms is yet uncertain. It may be that the rescripts will be in effect nothing more than the appointment of Turgot by Louis XVI. and his subsequent recall when he attempted to inaugurate those radical reforms that alone would have averted the French Revolution. If so, the present action of the autocratic government will merely serve to postpone a terrible day of reckoning. On the other hand, if the Czar and his councilors are thor-

oughly sincere and are resolute in the enforcement of the reforms promised, it is highly probable that Russia will proceed along the highway of liberal government in a progressive, peaceful, and evolutionary manner. Be that as it may, the universal discontent throughout the land of the White Czar has reached that point where no absolute or autocratic power can crush it.

The light is dawning in the East, and whether the day is preceded by the lurid fires of forcible revolution, or the twilight gives place to the dawn as winter yields to spring, of one thing we may be assured, and that is that the light is breaking in the East. All forward steps of this kind taken by a people not corrupted by venality, dominated by avarice, or weakened by licentiousness have proved the marching orders for real progress.

* * *

SOCIAL DEMOCRACY AGAINST THE FIELD IN GERMANY.

The battle between the reactionary and progressive impulses—between democracy and free government on the one hand and absolutism, oppression, a censored press, and intolerance on the other—is being waged with deadly earnestness throughout Germany. The Emperor, though at heart despotic,—as is shown from the fact that since his accession more than six thousand editors and other prominent Germans have been thrown into prison for *lèse-majesté*, or criticizing the oppressions of autocratic rule,—is marshaling all the powers at his disposal to crush the social democrats in the pending election.

But what is at once more portentous and significant of the alarm of all reactionary influences is seen in the amazing spectacle of the union of the conservatives, the so-called liberals, representing the capitalistic class dependent upon special privilege, and the clericals or Romanists into one powerful coalition against social democracy. As a result we have seen during past months the enactment of a vast number of laws that are either extremely reactionary or cruelly oppressive; and, in order to check the growing number of socialist representatives in the Reichstag, not only are all the influence and power that the government dares to employ brought into requisition, but a signed union has been effected for electoral purposes, as will

be seen from the following despatch cabled from Berlin on March 10th:

"Under a written agreement all the political parties in Saxony are united against the socialists. The compact's chief feature is a pledge not to nominate candidates against each other in districts already held by one of these parties, and assigning the several districts now represented by socialists to the parties entering into the agreement. A union of the parties is being effected in other parts of the empire, and the election will be a contest between the socialists and all other parties except small radical groups."

This, of course, will tend greatly to reduce the representation of the socialists in the Reichstag. Yet it is doubtful that in the end socialism will gain by the unholy alliance for despotism and reaction; for it will be remembered that, when Bismarck undertook to stamp out socialism with an iron hand, it flamed up all over the empire and grew with marvelous rapidity.

In the election of 1898 the socialists polled 2,300,000 votes—a formidable opposition for absolutism to attempt to curb, either by force or injustice and finesse; and we incline to believe that, though in the pending elections social democracy may lose many seats, in the end it will be strengthened rather than weakened by this *mesalliance* of the Lutherans, the Roman clericals, the absolutists or reactionaries, and the so-called liberals of the *bourgeois* class.

* * *

THE SPIRIT OF FRATERNALISM V/S. GOVERNMENTAL FAVORITISM.

The beneficiaries of vicious governmental favoritism have been loud in their outcries against every sane movement looking toward extending in a helpful way the aid of the government to the less fortunate ones as an act of justice and of wisdom, and with equal bitterness have they inveighed against the extension of government in such a way that all the people should reap the benefits of natural monopolies. Every effort of the State to help man to help himself, or to employ the public utilities by the whole people for the benefit of all, has been cried down as "paternalism"; and we have been told, by the mouthpieces and special pleaders of those who were becoming immensely rich through the exploitation and oppression of the

people, that the Republic had no right to meddle with the concerns of individuals or to extend its functions. Yet in each instance such action would have been a fuller expression of fraternalism in the State by which the nation would have been greatly strengthened and the interests of all the people best conserved. Furthermore, in almost every instance those who have declaimed against governmental ownership and operation of public utilities and the governmental employment of out-of-works have been fattening off of that most dangerous and un-republican of evils, governmental favoritism—a species of governmental paternalism that grants special privileges to the few by which the many are placed at a disadvantage, and often at the complete mercy of the few. The life, progress, and victory of democracy depend on the existence of the spirit of fraternalism; its most deadly peril is found in special privileges or governmental favoritism—the paternalism of the unjust parent.

BOOKS OF THE DAY.

REVIEWED BY B. O. FLOWER.*

THE PERVERTS. By William Lee Howard, M.D. Cloth, 388 pp.
Price, \$1.50. New York: G. W. Dillingham Company.

I.

Few problem novels or scientific studies clothed in the pleasing robes of fiction have appeared in recent years so well calculated to arrest the attention and compel the serious consideration of the thoughtful as Dr. William Lee Howard's remarkable romance entitled "The Perverts."

The author is a well-known physician, distinguished for his scientific studies, especially in the field of neurotic diseases. His researches and conclusions given in various papers on mental disease, the perversion of sexual instincts, and allied pathological phenomena, have placed him among the foremost scientific physicians in the United States. Thus he is peculiarly well fitted to discuss dipsomania, sexual perversion, and other phases of neurosis with which the volume is so largely concerned, and which, indeed, form the chief *motif* of the work. The author is not only an able thinker and a high authority in his field of research, but he is animated by the noblest of motives—that of the reduction of present-day vice to the minimum and its ultimate eradication through the introduction of rational and scientific treatment and measures, not the least of whose benefits would be the rapid improvement of the human species during its evolution: an improvement susceptible of being made as striking as that found in the culture of flowers, vegetables, fruits, and animal life under man's direction and guidance.

A little over a century ago the tomato was a little, marble-like, red growth, very strong and acrid in flavor, tough, and considered entirely unfit for food, it being grown merely as an ornamental plant. Through careful cultivation and rational treatment it has been transformed into the large, luscious, and important food product so enjoyed to-day. In the floral world witness the almost incredible improvements and transformations that have been wrought through wise and rational culture in the pink, the pansy, and various other well-known flowers. And what is true in the vegetable world is quite as marked in the improvement of domestic animals under modern scientific care and treatment.

*Books intended for review in THE ARENA should be addressed to B. O. Flower, 5 Park Square, Boston, Mass.

Yet, when we come to the human race, the incredibly important facts relative to improvement in life are blindly ignored, and society is yearly receiving the spawn of a veritable world of criminality and degeneration; while even the rational discussion of the importance of unions made with a view to the improvement of the race and the introduction of children who shall prove a blessing to the world and aught but a curse to themselves arouses the blind prejudice of the Church and society; while the same element insists on treating the victims of morally criminal unions—the dipsomaniacs and certain other neurotic offenders against society—as criminals instead of as persons as much diseased as are the victims of epilepsy or tuberculosis.

Now, against these palpable wrongs,—these grave crimes against the individual and civilization, born of religious prejudice, superstition, and ignorance,—Dr. Howard protests with the convincing power of a clear, incisive thinker trained to the critical methods of modern scientific research.

The subjects treated of are of so delicate a character that, in the hands of a bungler or a writer whose mind was in any degree tainted by pruriency or morbidity, the story could not prove other than revolting; but under the pen of this author subjects rarely dwelt upon in fiction are so presented as to prove unoffensive to the most sensitive among normal minds, however much the reader may dissent from the author's views on religion, on the sphere of woman, and other theological or social and philosophic questions.

So important a work as this cannot in justice to the reader be dismissed with a few words. The motive is too important when so ably treated, even though the work as a literary production were far less notable than is "The Perverts;" and intelligently to consider the strong and weak points of the volume, or what to us appear its excellences and defects, it will be necessary to notice it first as a romance, second as a study of dipsomania and allied neurotic states, and third as a criticism on religious and social subjects.

II.

A rule, fiction that is employed as a vehicle for the propagation of some special theory or view—whether economic, scientific, social, or theological—is a miserable failure when considered merely as a romance creation. The overmastering thought of the author usually destroys his literary and imaginative prowess, and those not especially interested in the subject that is the motive of the work find the volume wearisome reading. In this respect Dr. Howard's work is a pleasing exception to the rule; for though the author is a scientific historian rather than a romance writer, and though he lacks something of the realistic power of Zola, Frank Norris, and other modern novelists, still he evinces in a marked degree imagination, dramatic power, and skill in the construction of the story that render the novel a book of absorbing, and at times of intense, interest.

The cool, calculating, but demoniac efforts of the pervert, Mizpra

Newcomber, to destroy her brother, his wife, and their child; her determination to ruin her sisters, to bring her mother completely under her own control, and thereby obtain full possession of a large fortune that should have been equitably divided among all the children; the mastery over her weak husband and the power she exerts over a former Jesuit who has committed certain crimes of which Mizpra is cognizant; and the devious ways in which she utilizes her long studies in bacteriology, hypnotism, and medicine in attempting to compass her diabolical purposes—invest many chapters with thrilling interest only equaled by the story of the struggles of the brother, Leigh Newcomber, the dipsomaniac who rises superior to his inherited curse by the scientific knowledge that he has obtained, and that furthermore enables him successfully to meet and overcome the attempts against the life, happiness, and reputation of himself, his wife, and their child.

The saving power of true goodness exerted by a noble woman who protects the young physician and his wife at critical moments, and by a large-hearted and scholarly physician, is brought into bright relief—as are the highly suggestive illustrations of how the hero was saved from becoming the victim of a most nefarious plot by a degraded woman of the street, because he had pitied and befriended her and protected the life of her child on another occasion, and further showing how through kindness and mercy shown to the tool of her sister, when the wretched man was in his power, the physician ultimately triumphed over the machinations of the perverted Mizpra. These form golden threads running through the web and woof of the story, teaching far more important lessons in a practical way than are found in volumes of conventional theological sermons.

Leigh Newcomber is not only a strong, well-drawn personality, but his struggles with the baleful curse of his inheritance, his essential nobleness, his tenderness and humanity, his strength in the midst of inherited weakness, his salvation through knowledge of the cause of his weakness, and his resolute determination to save himself, cannot fail to prove a tremendous inspiration to thousands who read the volume.

Considered merely as a novel, the work is one of more than ordinary interest and merit.

III.

That, however, which gives special value to "The Perverts" is the masterly and scientific manner in which the too little understood subject of dipsomania and other perversions due to neurotic conditions is treated by Dr. Howard. Here this immensely important subject is presented so clearly and incisively that the dullest mentality cannot fail to comprehend the author's reasoning, while it is accompanied by such striking and impressive illustrations that the truths presented cannot fail to be lastingly impressed on the mind.

The interest in the story is increased by the author's statement that the characters depicted "are not imaginary, but are drawn from cases taken from my note-book. Obviously some are toned down and others

polished up to meet the purposes of the story, but, instead of being exaggerated, most of the characters have had some of their impulses kept within reasonable bounds."

In discussing dipsomania our author makes many profoundly thoughtful observations, which are well calculated to modify the unthinking prejudice and popular opinion on this subject. For example, he observes:

"The public gazes at the club-footed child, or the deformed adult, and utters a sigh of sympathy or an expression of regret that the parents or friends have allowed the sufferer to go uncured, the deformity uncorrected. The child whose twitchings are the symptoms of St. Vitus' dance is the cynosure of its playmates, and often the victim of their ignorant ridicule. The child's distressing uneasiness and odd muscular movements, however, are recognized as the effects of disease, and the social attitude of young and old adapted to this recognition. Does the public ever realize that *any* group of cells which make up the human body are liable to be distorted, undeveloped, or misplaced during their formative period? That, while we pity the man with the deformed bones, and appreciate the fact that the deformity is due to no fault of his conduct, the man who was born with an analogous psychic defect is shunned, ostracized, and meets with social degradingolade? It is the same old story. The world is ever too eager to censure what it does not understand. What is objective it accepts; what is subjective it ignores or ridicules.

"With its knowledge of modern corrective surgery, the world blames the parents who allow their children to grow up deformed, rightly holding them responsible for not having had the defect remedied. But if the child grows up with some defect in its controlling centers, if the nervous system is a little unbalanced, the neglect and ignorance of the parents increase the instability, and the result in the adult is some form of impulsiveness. For the objective signs of this impulsiveness the helpless one is thrust aside, and the real offenders—the parents—meet with the sympathy of the world.

"If this symptom of a nervous affection exists in the man of ordinary intellect; if this man periodically demonstrates his restlessness by resorting to alcohol to relieve his horrible feelings, it is called by the unthinking masses vicious drunkenness. This condition, however,—the disease inebriety, or its rabid form, dipsomania,—rarely prevails in the man of ordinary mental powers.

"The psychic conditions producing the unreasonable passion to consume enormous quantities of alcohol, morphine, and allied drugs is as distinct an affection as is the physical epilepsy seen daily on our streets.

"Dipsomania—not drunkenness—is mostly seen in the man with extraordinary mental powers; the genius. It is here the laws of Nature reveal themselves most plainly in the extreme of their manifestation. The world tries to excuse, palliate, or smooth over with specious and unscientific methods the moral eccentricities of these individuals. It calls them unfortunate vices, when in truth they are symptoms of disease.

"In a genius we have the development of a single faculty at the expense of others. When this greatly developed faculty has for the time being exhausted itself, the other undeveloped faculties run riot, and we have the sad phenomena of some form of psychic epilepsy. This psychic riot, if inherited, does not necessarily take the form it had in a past generation. Environment controls the phenomena. This follows the law of material progress. The fundamental cause

remains the same, but the effects are governed by circumstances. Hence, men are more like the times they live in than they are like their fathers.

"Bad social conditions, unfavorable environments, a predisposition for alcohol through heredity, faulty training, and neglect of moral education will cause lawlessness, drunkenness, and its concomitant vices; but, aside from the vexed question of heredity, we have none of these conditions existing as the cause of true dipsomania, but only as the effect during the attack. The unfortunate victims of this form of defective nervous inheritance are generally those whose surroundings are the best, individuals of genial and honest natures, bright and highly intellectual; many have been the most brilliant of their time.

"As the majority of the individuals who suffer from attacks of dipsomania are those who live at a high nervous and mental pressure,—physicians, litterateurs, artists, and musicians,—exhaustion of nervous energy is frequent and often continuous, and the reserve brain power is soon used up.

"Such mental spendthrifts as Cromwell, Humboldt, Goethe, and Dante had no capital to transfer to their sons. The almost simple-minded Duke of Reichstadt,—*"L'Aiglon,"*—the legitimate son of Bonaparte, was the result of the ruined mental vigor of the hero of forty campaigns.

"Among the men and women of genius who had both the alcohol and opium habits were Coleridge, Thompson, De Quincey, Carew, Sheridan, Steele, Addison, Hoffman, Charles Lamb, Madame de Staël, Burns, Savage, Alfred de Musset, Pierre Dupont, Kliet, Carracci, Jean Steen, Morland, Turner, Gerard de Nerval, Dussez, Handel, Gluck, Praga, Rovani, and the poet Somerville. The list might be carried out to an astonishing extent, confining it strictly to the present times. But we must not forget poor, misunderstood Edgar Allan Poe. Science has changed many of the old views of the order of things in the last decade, but in nothing has she been so gracious as in taking away the stigma of drunkenness too long attached to that American genius. Born with intellectual powers beyond the ken of his contemporaries, he also tried to struggle through his physical life heavily burdened by a psychic form of epilepsy over which he could not possibly have control, and which at intervals held him in its impulsive grasp. Literature always recognized Poe's genius. Science now recognizes his disease."

On intemperance in the United States our author says:

"In the United States it is probably true that the ordinary drinking of strong stimulants is on the decrease. This is so because the normally developed man recognizes its curse, sees its fearful ravages on those who suffer from a disease which tyrannically demands alcohol, and later on morphine, to quiet an agonizing unrest, and profits by the lesson. But, unfortunately, it is also a fact that the *conditions* which produce the rabid impulse to consume enormous quantities of stimulants—the disease dipsomania—are on the increase in this country. Nothing but an early knowledge, either in the parents or in the individual himself, of a tendency to neurotic disease will check the progressive and forceful growth from gradual stimulation to the disease inebriety, or the insane conditions of dipsomania.

"Let the parents be as careful in watching for some direct or atavistic neurosis as they are in watching the child's physical and religious formation, and the question of intemperance will be seen to be governed by natural laws, and the cure of inebriety and dipsomania shown to rest on a purely physiologic basis. The vices and habits of man, as vices and habits purely, will always be with us. But the increase of vice can be controlled by a frank admission of facts."

The above quotations will give some idea of the author's style and method of presenting the subject with which the book is chiefly concerned. On the whole his views on these subjects are so richly well worth reading and so important that the volume merits a far wider circulation than can be hoped for it, owing to the author's outspoken and uncompromising assaults on popular religious and social views and theories.

IV.

Dr. Howard is a pronounced free-thinker, a materialist, or perhaps a Deist; but his hostility to Christianity as revealed in his hero's views is very marked. From the Unitarian clergyman, who "remembers what he is taught and forgets what he thinks," to the Roman Catholic, he has little use for the churches. Now, so far as a church retards the exercise of reason by prescribing what a man may or may not read and think, or by making him so much the creature of fear that mental development and growth are hindered, it unquestionably checks progress; and doubtless in very many cases the teachings of the Church have unfavorably affected highly-sensitive, emotional, and neurotic individuals, not infrequently occasioning pronounced insanity. But, on the other hand, we believe the Church has proved one of the most powerful agencies in controlling unfortunate tendencies and vicious appetites. On this point we could cite very, very many cases that have come under our personal observation. Moreover, we are not prepared to accept as demonstrated facts the theories of Lombroso, and the school of which he is the illustrious head, touching the phenomena of genius. Nor do we hold the emotional nature and the imaginative faculties in such contempt as does our author. By ignoring the spiritual man the materialistic school, it seems to us, mistakes a partial appearance for the whole, and thus much that is potentially highest and best escapes the vision of its disciples.

To assume with Lombroso and men of his school that genius is merely the development of a single faculty, or dogmatically to reason on the assumption that religion is born of the emotional or sentimental side of life, and that there is no warrant for belief in a future state; that the spiritual world is the phantom of emotionalism; that the soul or spirit as something persistent after death is non-entity; or to flout the emotional side of life, enthroning reason as the only rightful ruling element in man, is in our judgment to presume far beyond the limits that present knowledge warrants.

Men of genius have frequently been very many-sided, and their noblest creations have possessed a wonderful potency in exalting that which is finest and purest and highest in life. If these assumptions are to be accepted, then it follows that reason alone is to be recognized in the tribunal of the mind, and the great poets, artists, sculptors, and musicians, who are preëminently the interpreters of the imagination and emotions, are to be dismissed as simply manifestations of unbalanced mentality or life in which some special faculties have been abnormally

stimulated and developed, notwithstanding the fact that their creations stir the profoundest depths and awaken the noblest aspirations and desires in the brain of millions who come under the influence of their power, thus stimulating life in all its higher centers so as to exalt, uplift, and enrich civilization for all future time.

Is it not more probable that these thinkers, however splendid may be their intellectual attainments and their power to reason upon physical phenomena, are too deficient in imagination and emotion to be able to appreciate some of the profoundest verities in life or to recognize the potential salvation of society through the dominion of a noble idealism, vivified by the basic spiritual truths that, like love, appeal preëminently to the emotional life?

On the question of woman's sphere, while many of Dr. Howard's observations are doubtless true, we are impressed with the conviction that here again he lacks breadth of vision—it is so easy to accept a partial appearance for the whole. If conditions of justice prevailed and if mutual love and consideration obtained in the home life, there could be no doubt that woman would be far happier at the head of a home. But what is the main cause of the unrest among women to-day? Is it not the absence of these things, and are not the children who come as a result of enforced motherhood (children who are in no high sense the offspring of love) one of the main causes of physical, nervous, and mental degeneracy in society to-day? Has not Dr. Howard overlooked perhaps the chief cause of neurosis in modern life? Children who come into homes where love is dead, and where the wife feels an aversion for the man who claims the rights of a husband, cannot be other than fatally handicapped and in the long run, in many instances, prove a positive curse to society. Is it not possible that Dr. Howard, who has studied one question from a view-point diametrically opposed to that occupied by millions of other men and women, may here as elsewhere have accepted a partial appearance for the whole?

Though we think our author's religious and social criticisms are open to serious question, and though at times they are diametrically opposed to those we entertain, yet we could heartily wish all thoughtful men and women to read this book, because of the really vital, timely, and important thought it contains, and also because it would give to most of them a new view-point from which to consider some of life's most serious problems.

UNDER THE ROSE. By Frederic W. Isham. Cloth, illustrated in colors. Price, \$1.50. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

"Under the Rose" is the best romantic novel we have read in months. It is a story invested with a subtle and delicate charm seldom found in the present-day romantic and so-called historical novels, in which brag and bluster are usually present, and the hero is of the swash-

buckler sort who not infrequently affects modesty in his narration to emphasize his prodigies of valor and his improbable feats and achievements. This story, on the other hand, is exciting and frequently highly dramatic, and, in spite of some melodramatic climaxes that detract from its probability, is a beautiful mystery tale that unfolds into a charming romance of love.

The scenes are laid in the eventful first century of Modern Times. The historic background is the gay, cynical, cruel, and voluptuous court of the ambitious and vainglorious Francis, the patron of arts and culture, a king of strange contradictions that were constantly exemplified in the most surprising ways, as, for example, in his burning of heretics at the behest of Rome, and on the other hand imprisoning the Pope and entering into an alliance with the Mohammedan Solyman.

There are some admirable pictures of court life in this summer-time of pseudo-chivalry, and among the interesting figures introduced is Rabelais, who, if we except John Calvin, was the most powerful intellect in the France of that period; while the pen pictures of Francis and of the Emperor Charles V. are admirably drawn.

The chief interest in the tale, however, centers in the hero, who is supposed to be the jester of the Duke of Friedwald, and Jacqueline, jocularatrix to the Princess Louise. The latter is supposed to be the daughter of the gardener at the castle of Dubrois. The hero is not the coarse, wine-drinking, devil-may-care character of the conventional historical romantic novels of our day, but rather a person of rare charm and delicacy of feeling; a gentleman who is at once brave, learned, imaginative, and true hearted; a Protestant who dared to carry the works of Calvin with him at a time when to do so was a capital offense. Jacqueline is also a strong, striking, and unique creation in romantic fiction, quite as attractive as the supposed jester; and the experiences of these two are replete with deadly peril and exciting incidents, some of which are highly romantic. At length, however, love conquers, bringing felicity to the noble central figures who have played the rôle of life in the motley.

This is a story that would lend itself to dramatic representation, and, we think, make a far better play than many dramatizations of recent novels that have proved successful.

THE INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM. By Herman Lieb.

Cloth, 178 pp. Chicago: H. Lieb, Jr., & Co.

This is a volume that should be possessed and carefully read by every thoughtful voter. It is a complete, well-digested discussion of the initiative and referendum and their bearings on American politics. Perhaps the most valuable and interesting chapters are those giving the origin and historical development, together with the practical workings, of direct legislation in Switzerland. The book is timely, clear, and convincing.

NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS.

THE symposium on the Mormon question with which our magazine opens this month is of peculiar timeliness owing to the recent election of Reed Smoot as Utah's representative in the upper house of Congress. The failure of the Salt Lake Ministerial Association to prove that the incumbent is a polygamist has shifted the battle waged against Mr. Smoot on to different ground—that he represents a church hierarchy rather than the people of Utah. Concerning this allegation, the contribution by President Joseph F. Smith may be regarded as an official statement of the institution's attitude toward its office-holding members. That religious history is repeating itself in this latter-day development of theology is seen in our second paper, in which the head of the "Reorganized" church gives the reasons for its protestantism and secession; while the view of Evangelical Christianity, as presented by the general secretary of the National Anti-Mormon Missionary Association, in opposition to both the contending factions, completes the symposiac requirements—a conflict of opinion that impels the reader to form his own conclusions.

The reports furnished by our staff correspondents of the proceedings of the recent Municipal Ownership Convention embody the vital results of what was undoubtedly the most important gathering of the kind ever held. Meetings assembled for the discussion of popular control and operation of public necessities are regarded in a more serious vein than formerly—due quite as much to the corruption and abuses of corporate monopoly as to the logic of facts and figures and the number of distinguished economists and statesmen enlisted in the advocacy of their municipalization. That this idea is spreading also among the mass of voters is proved by the recent reëlection of Tom L. Johnson as mayor of Cleveland, of Samuel M. Jones as mayor of Toledo, and of Carter Harrison as mayor of Chicago—all candidates of the people running on platforms demanding the abolition of special privileges and the establishing of popular rights in the management of common utili-

ties. The convention marks an epoch in the evolution of purer political ideals and points unmistakably to a brighter economic day in the vista of civic government in America.

The centennial anniversary of the acquisition of Louisiana, which is about to be celebrated in a triumphant World's Exposition, renders opportune the publication this month of Editor Flower's study of the immortal Jefferson and his contribution to racial progress. It is perhaps the most searching and informing of our series of biographic papers, for it conveys many salutary lessons to the would-be Republic-builders of to-day and is most vital in its admonitory portions.

The pressure on our space caused by these three lengthy features compels the withholding for later insertion of Editor Flower's continuation of "The Case against the Trusts," the Hon. Boyd Winchester's paper on "The Lust of Money," and our usual short-story contribution.

The recent decree of the Czar, announcing the inception of certain long-needed reforms in the internal government of the Muscovite Empire, imparts unique interest to Mr. Hourwich's paper on "Religious and Political Liberty in Russia," in this issue. It is not difficult to see in either the irresistible nature of the law of progress, though civilization may be retarded for centuries through man's abuse of his vaunted "free agency." This essay is authoritative, as the author is a widely known writer on Russian topics, having contributed extensively to American and European periodicals, and has written a monograph on "The Economics of the Russian Village," which appears in the second volume of the Columbia University studies in economics, history, and public law.

THE ARENA has yielded much space, during the last few years, to the discussion of subjects having a more or less direct bearing on Socialism; but it is probable that a more comprehensive and accurate definition of the doctrine itself has not appeared in any impartial journal than the article we publish this month by William L. Garver, the well-known author of "Brother of the Third Degree." We are glad thus to aid in the removal of many misconceptions in the average mind concerning one of the most significant developments of modern philosophy.

The June ARENA, which will complete our Twenty-ninth Volume, will contain, in addition to the features above mentioned, a timely paper on "Treason," by Capt. W. P. Kent; "The Federal Judge," by Edward M. Winston; "Will the Churches Survive?" by the Rev. C. E. Ordway, and a Southern view of "The Negro Problem," by J. M. Bicknell, who reaches conclusions quite different from those of Col. Hemstreet on the same subject in the current number.

J. E. M.